

ASC
BT
200
.G74
1841

HER.

Eph i, 4, 7 Chosen
us in Christ before the
founding of the world
in whom we have
redemption through his
blood the forgiveness of sins
Col i, 14 the same

Rom iii, 24-26 Being
justified freely by his
grace, through the redemption
that is in Christ Jesus
Whom God hath set forth
to be a propitiation through
faith in his blood to
declare his righteousness for
the remission of sins that
are past &c.

Ch v, 9 Being now justified
by his blood we shall
be saved from wrath
10 Remitted by his death
11 Who we received the atonement
2 Cor v, 18 Who both reconciled
Col i, 20 Reconciled all things

1st John vi, 16 Who for us
heaven
20 Giver of life eternally the life
30 Atoning for you to cleanse

J. B. Frisbie

12, 15
John ix, 22 By the blood
purged with blood
xii, 24 Blood of the Son of Man
John xiii, 12 Washing the feet
with his own blood

1st John i, 7 Blood of Christ
his sin cleansed in
him all sin

Rom v, 9 With his blood
most redeemed us to
God by his blood
Chap vii, 14, 30 Washing
washed robes white
the blood of the Son of Man

AN
ADVENT SOURCE COLLECTION
General Conference
WASHINGTON, D. C.
No. 1570 OF

THE DIVINE TESTIMONY,

CONCERNING THE CHARACTER

1841

G86

OF THE

SON OF GOD.

BY HENRY GREW,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.

"This is my beloved Son."

"When we have humbly and attentively considered and ascertained the meaning of any proposition, we should implicitly believe it, how contrary soever it may be to our former opinion, or that of others in reputation for wisdom."
SCOTT.

SECOND EDITION.

ADVENTIST

HERITAGE CENTER

James White Library

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

PHILADELPHIA:

MERRIHEW AND THOMPSON, PRINTERS,
No. 7 Carter's Alley.

1841

THE DIVINE TESTIMONY.
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

SIXTEEN years have elapsed since the first edition of this little volume was, for the truth's sake, presented to my beloved brethren in the Lord. The knowledge, that, through divine favor, it has been the means of leading some to a more correct understanding of "the only true God," and of Jesus Christ whom he has sent, has excited my grateful praise to the God of salvation.

Confirmed by subsequent research into the precious treasury of God's holy Word, of the truth and glory of the doctrine, that the ONE GOD is THE FATHER, and that Jesus Christ is his *first and only begotten Son*, I send forth, with humble prayer, this second edition, commending it to the candid examination of the reader, but more especially to the blessing of Him whose Spirit disposes us to abandon those traditions which make void the doctrine and commandments of the Lord.

Veritas. Pige. O spirit of truth! beam on my dark mind, irradiate my benighted soul, to know him who is the joy of earth, and the glory of heaven. Open upon me the vision of truth, and shine into my heart, to give me the light of the knowledge of thy glory as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ. Rectify the errors of my understanding, and remove the coldness of my heart, by the overflowing of thy holy love. Oh, elevate my soul to the contemplation of the things which "the angels desire to look into;" the divinity, the humanity, the wisdom, power and love of that blest name which "is as ointment poured forth."

And while I am "looking unto Jesus," encircle me with that holy radiance of truth which shall dispel all my darkness. O my God, what thou hast been pleased, in thine infinite love, to reveal concerning thy "beloved Son," that mortals may have a glimpse of thy glory, grant me to know. I desire not to look into those "secret things" which belong to thee alone. It is my highest felicity to acknowledge, to love, and to adore thee as the incomprehensible source of all perfection, and to feel, that in thy sight I am less than nothing and vanity. But, O my Father, is it not my eternal life to know thee, "the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent?" Thou seest me encompassed with mine own infirmity, and with the diverse systems and traditions of erring men. Oh, call me away from these polluted streams to thine own pure fountain. Pity a poor worm of the dust that looks towards thee to direct his path, and in thine infinite condescension and mercy, grant me an understanding of that "wisdom of God" which the redeemed multitude shall celebrate to eternity, for thy dear Son's sake. Amen.

And while I am "looking unto Jesus," encircle me with that holy radiance of truth which shall dispel all my darkness. O my God, what thou hast been pleased, in thine infinite love, to reveal concerning thy "beloved Son," that mortals may have a glimpse of thy glory, grant me to know. I desire not to look into those "secret things" which belong to thee alone. It is my highest felicity to acknowledge, to love, and to adore thee as the incomprehensible source of all perfection, and to feel, that in thy sight I am less than nothing and vanity. But, O my Father, is it not my eternal life to know thee, "the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent?" Thou seest me encompassed with mine own infirmity, and with the diverse systems and traditions of erring men. Oh, call me away from these polluted streams to thine own pure fountain. Pity a poor worm of the dust that looks towards thee to direct his path, and in thine infinite condescension and mercy, grant me an understanding of that "wisdom of God" which the redeemed multitude shall celebrate to eternity, for thy dear Son's sake. Amen.

And while I am "looking unto Jesus," encircle me with that holy radiance of truth which shall dispel all my darkness. O my God, what thou hast been pleased, in thine infinite love, to reveal concerning thy "beloved Son," that mortals may have a glimpse of thy glory, grant me to know. I desire not to look into those "secret things" which belong to thee alone. It is my highest felicity to acknowledge, to love, and to adore thee as the incomprehensible source of all perfection, and to feel, that in thy sight I am less than nothing and vanity. But, O my Father, is it not my eternal life to know thee, "the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent?" Thou seest me encompassed with mine own infirmity, and with the diverse systems and traditions of erring men. Oh, call me away from these polluted streams to thine own pure fountain. Pity a poor worm of the dust that looks towards thee to direct his path, and in thine infinite condescension and mercy, grant me an understanding of that "wisdom of God" which the redeemed multitude shall celebrate to eternity, for thy dear Son's sake. Amen.

And while I am "looking unto Jesus," encircle me with that holy radiance of truth which shall dispel all my darkness. O my God, what thou hast been pleased, in thine infinite love, to reveal concerning thy "beloved Son," that mortals may have a glimpse of thy glory, grant me to know. I desire not to look into those "secret things" which belong to thee alone. It is my highest felicity to acknowledge, to love, and to adore thee as the incomprehensible source of all perfection, and to feel, that in thy sight I am less than nothing and vanity. But, O my Father, is it not my eternal life to know thee, "the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent?" Thou seest me encompassed with mine own infirmity, and with the diverse systems and traditions of erring men. Oh, call me away from these polluted streams to thine own pure fountain. Pity a poor worm of the dust that looks towards thee to direct his path, and in thine infinite condescension and mercy, grant me an understanding of that "wisdom of God" which the redeemed multitude shall celebrate to eternity, for thy dear Son's sake. Amen.

ASC

BT

200

.G74

1841

Nov.

#6647182

DIALOGUE.

Amicus. I AM informed, my dear Veritas, that you have given up the glorious doctrines of the Trinity, and the supreme deity of the Son of God;—doctrines which the true church has always maintained as the foundation of hope and objects of rejoicing. Feeling a deep interest in the cause of truth and in your welfare, I called this morning to enquire of you respecting this report.

Veritas. I thank you, beloved Amicus, for your christian solicitude, and for coming to me as a friend and a brother. How lamentable is the conduct of some christians, who are more eager to spread abroad reports of a brother's sentiments, which generally misrepresent his real views, than to endeavor to restore him "in the spirit of meekness" from his supposed error. I freely confess to you that my views are changed respecting the subjects you mention. Having adopted the principle, that the word of God is the only standard of truth, I have renounced those views, which I was taught in my youth, which do not appear to accord with the divine testimony. As, however, I feel that I am a fallible creature, I desire ever to attend with meekness and candor to the arguments which may be offered in opposition to my sentiments. If truth is our object, we shall not shrink from the strictest and closest investigation.

Amicus. Very true: and when brethren of different views, conscious of the imperfection of their knowledge, confer with each other, with a pure desire after truth, they may hope, by a candid examination of each argument, and a dependence on the Holy Spirit, to benefit one another, and to promote the cause of truth. But if we are only concerned to support our pre-conceived opinions, and to bear down those who oppose them, we are in a fair way to live and die in our error. I fear, however, my dear Veritas, that you have erred from "the faith once delivered to the saints."

Veritas. It is my sincere desire to receive every word of the divine testimony. Permit me, then, to ask, what revealed truth do you suppose I disbelieve?

Amicus. The doctrine of the Trinity, and the doctrine of the supreme deity of Jesus Christ.

Veritas. Please to repeat the passage of scripture which reveals to us that there are three persons in one God.

Amicus. I acknowledge that there is no passage which expressly declares this doctrine. But there are some passages from which the most pious and learned saints in all ages have inferred it.

Veritas. It is evident from the history of the church, that many christians in different ages have disbelieved it. Be this, however, as it may; were the christians you speak of infallible? Are they our standard of faith and practice?

Amicus. Certainly not.

Veritas. Allow me to ask you, dear brother, where you first learned the doctrine of the Trinity?

Amicus. I confess I was first taught it in the Assembly's Catechism; but I have since examined the word of God, and believe it is therein revealed.

Veritas. Do you not think, that by being taught the religious systems of pious men, (all which must be acknowledged to be imperfect) by those whom we revered and loved, that we were in danger of imbibing some errors? Do you not believe that when we read the scriptures in early life, we were far more apt to affix that sense to certain passages, which agreed with the catechism or creed we had learned, than to examine by scripture itself the real import of them? And have we not, consequently, reason to fear that many of our ideas on divine subjects have been received by tradition from our fathers, and not from the word of the Lord?

Amicus. I feel the propriety and force of your observations. I never before realized so much the danger we are in of being misled by the opinions and practices of men, deservedly esteemed, indeed, but fallible and imperfect.

Veritas. Since my faith respecting the doctrine of the Trinity was shaken, I have considered it my duty and privilege to examine *the whole* of the divine testimony, with particular reference to the subject, and to *compare all the passages* which relate to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Permit me to inquire, my dear Amicus, if you have ever done this?

Amicus. I confess I have never examined the subject in the manner you speak of. I am sensible, however, that it is the best method of ascertaining the truth, if it is done with a humble dependence on divine teaching.

Veritas. Without this all our researches will be vain. May the Lord in infinite mercy guide us into all truth.

PREFACE.

IN my researches after truth some years ago, my faith in the common doctrine of the Trinity was shaken. Deeply impressed with a sense of the importance of obtaining, so far as is revealed, a correct knowledge of "the only true God," and of Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, I have humbly endeavored to "search the scriptures," looking unto Jesus for the guidance of his holy Spirit which he promised his disciples to lead them into all truth. The result of this investigation, which has been delightful, though laborious, may be seen in the following pages. My desire, if I am not self-deceived, has been to ascertain, by diligently and prayerfully "comparing spiritual things with spiritual," what is revealed for my faith and love. Whether I have been guided by the Spirit of truth, or by my own wisdom, which is foolishness, will soon be determined at the bar of God. With that tribunal in view, it is indeed a small thing to be judged of man's judgment.

While I rejoice in all those exertions of Christians in the present day to advance the holy kingdom of the Redeemer, which accord with the "wisdom of God;" my mind has been deeply impressed with a sense of the vast importance of the heralds of "the everlasting gospel" possessing a correct knowledge of "the *only true God*," and of Jesus Christ *whom he hath sent*. How important that they should declare that gospel to perishing men, "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."

I beg leave to remark to the reader, that it is necessary to remember, that however firmly he may believe his present sentiments, no man is *infallible*. To read any work of this kind, with such a positive assurance of the correctness of our present views, as is consistent only with infallibility, is useless. We may as well cry out heresy, the moment we know an author's sentiments are contrary to our own, as to do so after we have heard his arguments, for such a feeling of mind will resist the most conclusive proofs, and prevent our conviction of the most important errors.

All I ask, is a candid examination of my views and arguments by "the word of the Lord." If they will not bear this test, I desire they may be rejected, as it is the truth of God alone I wish to advocate and publish.

Towards all such as are taught by the Spirit of truth, to believe on the Son of God as the only foundation of their

hope, and the object of their confidence, love and worship, I desire to extend the hand of christian fellowship, and to cherish the affection of holy love, although their views, in some important respects, may differ from my own. Far be it, that we should call "that common or unclean which God hath cleansed." Far be it from us to reject those whom the Lord hath received. May that forbearance which the merciful Redeemer exercises towards his disciples, be ever exercised by them towards one another. And let us never refuse to unite with the inspired apostle in pronouncing the divine benediction on "all that in every place call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord *both theirs and ours*." I desire to love all in whom I can trace the image of my dear Savior, whatever they may say or think of me.

Let those, however, who *refuse* to "call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord," solemnly consider what part they can have in the worship of the heavenly hosts who are saying, "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the LAMB for ever and ever."

Let those also who, in that wisdom which is foolishness with God, reject "the atonement" of his beloved Son, seriously consider what part they can have among that blessed assembly who have *all* "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

I rejoice and praise God that he hath mercifully spared my life to bear this testimony to his holy truth; and to his divine blessing I now humbly commend it.

CHAPTER I.

Containing an examination of the divine testimony concerning the highest character and glorious perfections of the Son of God.

1. *The testimony of the Prophets.*

Isa. ix. 6. And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, &c. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, &c. Isa. vii. 14. Matt. i. 23. Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted, is, God with us. Micah v. 2. Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. John iii. 31. He that cometh from heaven is above all. John i. 34. And I saw, and bear record that this is the Son of God. John iii. 36. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

2. *The testimony of the Apostles.*

John i. 1—3. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. Eph. iii. 3. 9. God created all things by Jesus Christ. Rev. xix. 13. And his name is called the Word of God. John xx. 28. And Thomas answered, and said unto him, My Lord, and my God. Rom. ix. 5. Christ—who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. Col. ii. 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Col. i. 15. Who is the image of the invisible God; the first-born of every creature, for by him were all things created, &c. Heb. i. 3. Who being the brightness of his (the Father's) glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, &c. Acts x. 36. He is Lord of all. John ii. 25. He knew what was in man. John vi. 64. Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him. John i. 4. In him was life. Matt. ix. 35. And Jesus went, &c. healing every sickness, and every disease among the people. Matt. xiv. 33. Then they that were in the ship came and worshiped him. John ix. 38. And he worshiped him. 2 Pet. iii. 18. To him be glory, both now and for ever. Amen. Rev. i. 6. To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

Rev. v. 12. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. Rev. v. 13. And every creature, &c. heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Rev. vii. 10. Salvation unto our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. Matt. xvi. 16. Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Acts ix. 20. And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God. Heb. iv. 14. We have a great high priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God. 1 John iv. 15. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. John xx. 31. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name. 1 John v. 5. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God. 1 John v. 10. 13. Rom. i. 3. 4. Rom. xiv. 10. We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. 2 Cor. v. 10.

3. *The testimony of Jesus Christ.*

Rev. i. 17. I am the first and the last. John viii. 58. Before Abraham was, I am. John x. 30. I and my Father are one. John v. 22, 23. For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father. John xvii. 5. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. Matt. xxviii. 18. All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. John xvii. 2. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. John x. 18. I have power to lay it down (my life) and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. John v. 26. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. Matt. ix. 6. The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins. Matt. xviii. 20. Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. Matt. xxviii. 20. Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Luke xxii. 69. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Matt. xxv. 31. When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, &c. John xi. 25. I am the

resurrection and the life. John ix. 35. Dost thou believe on the Son of God? John iii. 16. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life. John iii. 18. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already; because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

4. *The testimony of God the Father.*

Heb. i. 8. Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.—i. 6. When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him. Zech. xiii. 7. Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts. Matt. xvii. 5. This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him.

How glorious and precious is this divine testimony concerning the sinner's friend? Let us carefully examine what truths it plainly exhibits for our faith and love.

1. We have here most plainly revealed to us, that our blessed Savior *really existed before he appeared on earth.* He was before Abraham. He was with the Father in the beginning, and possessed glory with him before the world was. He came down from heaven. God created the world by him, consequently he must have *really and actually* existed in the beginning, and not merely in the divine purpose.

2. Here also the eye of faith beholds him with admiring joy, "*God over all.*" As by him all things were made, so by him all things consist. His throne is to endure through all generations. On that throne of inconceivable glory he appears encircled with holy majesty, the "King of kings, and Lord of lords."

3. *He is an object of worship.* To him every knee must bow. Angels are commanded to worship him. His disciples prayed to him and worshiped him. To him they committed their departing spirits.

4. In the divine character of the Son of God, he is presented to a dying world as *the only name "by whom we must be saved."* In him alone we have eternal life, believing in him as "the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

Let us then, with grateful joy, set to our "seal that God is true," by receiving the testimony concerning his Son. Let us build our hope for eternity on this foundation which God himself hath laid, for "other foundation can no man lay." Let us look for the remission of sins only through

his blood; and by this find access into the most holy place. Let us confide in him as our Savior, and obey him as "King on the holy hill of Zion." Let us unite with the redeemed multitude in ascribing the glory of salvation "to him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb." Finally, let us, like holy Stephen, commit our departing spirits into the arms of his mercy, assured that the "eternal judgment" of the great day will soon confirm the following testimony: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

CHAPTER II.

Containing an examination of the divine testimony concerning the ORIGIN of the highest and most glorious character of the SON of GOD.

1. *The testimony of the Prophets and Apostles.*

Col. i. 15—19. Who is the *image* of the invisible God, the *first-born* of every *creature*; for by him were all things created, &c.; for it *pleased the Father* that in him should all fulness dwell. Heb. i chap. God—hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, whom *he hath appointed* heir of all things, *by whom* also HE made the worlds, who being the brightness of his glory, and the express *image* of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, &c. being *made* so much better than the angels, &c. And again, when he bringeth the *first begotten* into the world, *he saith*, and let all the angels of God worship him. Unto the *Son* he saith, thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, *thy* God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. John i. 14. And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the *only begotten of the Father*, full of grace and truth. Rev. xix. 13. His name is called the *Word of God.* John iii. 31, 32. He that cometh from heaven is above all. And what *he hath seen and heard* that he testifieth. 34. For he whom *God hath sent* speaketh the words of God: For God *giveth* not the spirit by measure unto him. 35. The Father loveth the Son, and hath *given*

all things into his hand. 1 Cor. xi. 3. *The head of Christ is God.* Rev. i. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him.* Acts i. 22. *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him, &c.* Acts x. 38. *God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, &c.; for God was with him.* 1 Peter i. 22.—*God that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory.* Rom. ii. 16.—*God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.* Acts x. 42.—*Ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead.* Acts xvii. 31.

2. *The testimony of Jesus Christ.*

Rev. 3. 14. *These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the beginning of the creation of God.* John vi. 57.—*I live by the Father.* v. 26. *For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him authority to execute judgment, &c.* Matt. xi. 27. *All things are delivered unto me of my Father.* xxviii. 18. *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* John xvii. 2. *As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.* John x. 18. *I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.* John v. 19. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself.* John xiv. 10. *The Father, that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.* John v. 22. *For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.* John xvii. 24. *Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me: For thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.* John xvii. 5. *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* John viii. 26.—*He that sent me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him.* John xii. 49. *For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak.* John vii. 16. *My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.* John vi. 38. *For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* Luke xxii. 29. *And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed*

unto me. Matt. xii. 28. *But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, &c.*

3. *The testimony of God the Father.*

Ps. lxxxix. 19. *Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy one, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty.* 25. *I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers.* 26. *He shall cry unto me, thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation.* 27. *Also I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth.* Ps. ii. 7. *Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee.* Isa. xlii. 1. 6. *Behold my servant, whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my Spirit upon him. I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant to the people, for a light to the Gentiles.* Heb. i. 6—9. *And again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him.—Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.*

Guided by the light of heavenly truth, let us now proceed to the consideration of the following important and highly interesting question. Is Jesus Christ called God, is he worshiped, has he created the universe, is he preserver and Savior and King and Judge, as the *self-existent, independent, omnipotent and only true God*; or as the *Son of God, begotten, upheld, exalted and glorified by the Father*?

Revelation alone must answer this question. Let no conclusion of imperfect reason, no false inferences of our erring minds, no prejudice in favor of our long cherished systems, prevent our receiving the divine testimony on this subject.

Let us first consider *in what sense* the scriptures of truth apply the title of God, to Jesus Christ.

That the mere application of this title to Christ, does not prove him to be the self-existent Deity, is evident from the 82d Psalm, where we find it applied to earthly rulers. See also Exod. vii. 1. 22 chap. 28 verse. John x. 35. From Heb. i. 8. it is evident that it is as the *begotten Son*, that he is called God. “Unto the Son he saith, thy throne, O God,” &c. And in the very next verse, and in immediate connexion, the same person who is called God, is plainly

represented as having a God. "Therefore God, *even thy God,*" &c. See also John xx. 17. Rev. iii. 12. Here then, the scripture, which is its own best interpreter, plainly teaches us that he is not called God *in the highest sense*; for the supreme Deity can neither be *begotten* nor *have a God*.

John i. 1. In this passage of divine truth, it is declared that the Word, who is called God, "*was with God.*" Here also, the holy scripture teaches us, that in whatever sense the Word is called God, he is a distinct being from the supreme God, otherwise he could not be said to be *with God*. Now as it is no where expressly revealed that the Word or Son is "the same numerical essence," or the same being as the Father, how can the passage bear such a construction? We have scripture authority for saying, that the term God is sometimes used in an inferior or figurative sense; but have we any authority from scripture or reason for saying, that the supreme God *was with the supreme God*? "To what class of men could John address the asseveration," that the supreme God was with himself?—"Where did these singular heretics suppose" the supreme God was, except with himself? Is there any intelligible idea in the proposition, that the same numerical essence was with the same numerical essence? Or can we conceive that one supreme God was with another supreme God?

The scriptures of truth afford more light on this important text. In John xvii. 5, our dear Redeemer prays, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Here it is just as evident that the glory of the Word cannot be the glory of the supreme Deity, as that supreme Deity cannot be a subject of prayer. This cannot be considered the prayer of his human nature, for that nature, so far from enjoying glory "*before the world was,*" did not then exist. Our Savior evidently refers to the state of which John wrote, John i. 1. The same nature prays as then existed, to be restored to the same glorious condition. Does not this conclusively prove that the Son is dependent on the Father, for the highest glory he possesses?

Rev. xix. 13. Here we are instructed that the Word is "the Word of God." Is it not the design of the Spirit of truth to teach us, by this term, that the Son is the *medium* of communication or manifestation of all the glory of God, (in creation, providence and redemption,) to his intelligent

creatures? "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

Rom. ix. 5. Christ—who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. Here our precious Redeemer is again called God, over all God, which is expressive of his high authority and dominion. Compare this passage with Ps. xlv. 6. where Jesus is called God on the throne of the mediatorial kingdom. In the view of this glorious character, believers love and adore him. But whether he is possessed of this dominion, of *independent right*, or by the *pleasure and appointment* of the Father, the scriptures must determine. Dan. vii. 13, 14. I saw in the night-visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was *given* him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. Matt. xxviii. 18. All power is *given* unto me in heaven and in earth, John xvii. 2. As thou hast *given* him power over all flesh, &c. Luke xxii. 29. I *appoint* unto you a kingdom as my Father hath *appointed* unto me. Ps. ii. 6. 8. Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion: Ask of me and I *shall give thee* the heathen for thine inheritance, &c. Acts v. 31. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. Here we are taught that Jesus Christ executes the high offices of Prince and Savior; that he gives repentance and forgives sin, *all by the power and appointment of the Father*.

To be over all, and to have all things under him, are synonymous expressions. "But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him." 1 Cor. 15. 27. He is therefore dependent on another being, even the Father, for having all things under him, or being "over all."

The term "fellow," in Zech. xiii. 7, has been supposed to denote perfect equality. Let Heb. i. 9, be considered. Here the Son of God is said to have been anointed with the oil of gladness above his "*fellows.*" Whether the term here means those "many brethren" of whom he is "the first born," or the angels of heaven; it cannot mean *perfect equality*, for the Son has "a more excellent name" than

either. The primary meaning of the word fellow, is not equal, but companion.

If, then, the blessed God hath been pleased to glorify his only begotten and well beloved Son, and to accomplish his eternal purposes of wisdom and love; by setting him at his own right hand on the throne of the universe; is it not perfectly consistent with such a design, that Jesus Christ should be distinguished with adequate titles of dignity and glory? If they were called Gods to whom the word of God came; if even a material monument of the Lord's goodness may be called by the name of Jehovah, Exod. xvii. 15, are we surprised to find the Son (who is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the very image of the invisible God,) called God, over all God, &c.? These appellations are perfectly appropriate. He is over all Ruler or God. He is Lord of all, for to this pre-eminence "God hath highly exalted him." Phil. ii. 9.

It is the delightful privilege of the redeemed, both in heaven and on earth, to ascribe "glory and dominion for ever," "unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

Let us examine the divine testimony respecting this holy worship. On *what account* is it offered to the Lamb? John v. 22, 23. For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. I think it must be admitted, that no passage can be found which expresses higher honor to the Son than this. And it is very remarkable that this passage which has been so often quoted as proof of the Son's supreme deity, itself contains proof to the contrary. The reason why we are to honor the Son as we do the Father, is here assigned. Is it because he is "the same numerical essence?" No, but because the Father "hath committed all judgment" unto him. Unless then, we say, that we honor the Father because of authority committed to him, we must acknowledge that this very passage teaches us that we do not honor the Son in *all respects* as we do the Father.

Phil. ii. 9—11. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at (or in) the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, *to the glory of God the Father*. How evident it is from this text, and the precious truth in its con-

nection, that the Son of God is worshiped, not as supreme Jehovah, but on account of his great humiliation and perfect accomplishment of the mediatorial work: and that this worship is *to the glory of God the Father*.

Rev. i. 5, 6. In this passage he is worshiped because he has loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father. Rev. v. 12. As the Lamb that was slain. Matt. xiv. 33. His disciples worshiped him as the *Son of God*. Rev. v. 13. and vii. 10. He is worshiped in *distinction* from him that sitteth on the throne.

Shall we then, set in opposition to the divine testimony, the dictates of fallible reason, and say it is idolatry to worship him in distinction from "the only true God, who sitteth on the throne? Is it then idolatry to worship him *to the glory of God the Father*, and because the Father commands it? Shall we charge the worshipers in heaven with idolatry? It is remarkable that many Unitarians and Trinitarians, have wandered so far from what appears to be the truth, as to meet at the same point of error. Both refuse to imitate the heavenly worshipers, who worship the Lamb in *distinction* from the "most high God" who sitteth upon the throne.

The worship of the Son of God, has been supposed by some to be inconsistent with the declaration of Jehovah, "My glory will I not give to another." But what is the glory of Jehovah? Is it not the glory of *underived and independent existence*? Is it not the glory of possessing in himself *infinite perfection*; and of being, consequently, the *SUPREME* object of the love, confidence, and worship of all intelligences? If, then, the Father requires us to worship the Son, who is a *distinct person*, as the self-existent and independent Jehovah, it appears that *he has given his glory to another*. But if he requires us to honor and worship him on *account of all judgment or authority being committed to him by the Father*; and if he requires us to worship the Son "*to the glory of the Father*," it is evident that he has *not* given his glory to another.

It is admitted that it would be idolatry to worship two or more distinct persons or beings, considering them as supreme and *in all respects equal*, for this would be worshiping two or more supreme Gods. There are many pious Trinitarians who profess to believe the divine unity, who, nevertheless, worship *three distinct equal persons*. I do humbly and seriously suggest for their candid and solemn

consideration, whether this is consistent with their belief of the unity of God? And whether they can find a single precept or example for such worship in the scriptures of truth? I beseech them to reflect, whether it is possible for them, when they are worshipping, to have an idea of *three distinct equal persons*, without having an idea of *three distinct equal beings*? Is it possible for any one to conceive of "him that sitteth on the throne," as supreme God, and of him who is at the right hand of him who sitteth on the throne, as supreme God, without conceiving of *two supreme Gods*?

The repetition of the term Holy, as in Isa. vi. 3. "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts," has been thought by some to denote the doctrine of the Trinity. It is evident, however, that such repetition is *only significant of the importance of the subject*. Thus we read in Jer. xxii. 29. O earth, earth, earth, &c. And Ezek. xxi. 27. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, &c. Indeed, it is the practice of the Hebrews to this day, to say over some of their prayers or praises three times. They have no faith in the doctrine of the Trinity.

"The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." Whether this affords proof of supreme deity or not depends upon the question, whether this power was or was not derived from the Father? Acts v. 31, answers this question. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins."

Matthew xxviii. 19.—"Baptizing them," &c.

This passage, in the Greek, does not express the idea *by the authority of*, as in our translation; it is *into*, not *in* the Name of the Father, &c.; i. e. into the truth, or into a profession of the truth, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. What that truth is must be learned from other divine testimony. The passage itself does not declare, or necessarily imply, that the three are one God, or that they are three persons, or that they are equal.

It has been often asked, How can Jesus be present with his assembled disciples according to his promise, Matt. xviii. 20, except he is the omnipresent Jehovah? If we consider that the spirit is given him *without measure* by the Father, John iii. 34, we may easily conceive of his being spiritually present, not only in all parts of this atom of a world, but in all parts of the created universe. As the Son of God cast out devils *by the Spirit of God*, Matt. xii. 28,

so by the same Spirit, he is present with all true worshippers. John iii. 34, however teaches us that he is not infinite in himself, for if he was, he surely could not need any thing to be given him by another.

"God is a Spirit," the *only* "eternal Spirit." Consistently with this plain truth, we never find the Holy Spirit worshipped in distinction from the Father. If we did, we must either suppose *two eternal spirits*, or another spirit inferior to the Father. The following passage expresses an identity of the Father and the Spirit which is totally inconsistent with distinct personality. 1 Cor. ii. 11. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so, the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. The apostle indeed prayed, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Amen. But if this is a proof of the Spirit being a *distinct person*, the prayer of John, Rev. i. 4, appears to afford equal proof that the Spirit consists of *seven distinct persons*. In Luke ii. 32, 35, we are taught that Jesus is the Son of the Highest, and the Holy Ghost is the power of the Highest.

The expressions "pour out," "shed forth," used in reference to the Spirit of God, are additional evidence that it is not a distinct person, for such expressions are inapplicable to a person. It is true that these gracious influences proceeding from our Father in heaven, are personified, and the personal pronouns used in the case. So wisdom is personified, Prov. 8 chap. Let us candidly consider whether there can exist an infinite, intelligent, independent and omnipotent person, for the worship of whom there is not a single precept or example in all the Bible?

The pious author of those Trinitarian doxologies, which are now preferred by many christian assemblies, to the inspired one of Rev. v. 13, confessed "that there is in scripture no express precept for addressing such worship to the Spirit, nor any example of it, and that therefore this ought not to be considered as a necessary part of christian worship; though he thought it lawful, because the Spirit or power of God is truly divine."* How *lawful* that worship is, for which we have neither precept or example in the *word of truth*, may be learned from "the faithful witness." John iv. 24. God is a spirit; and they that worship him

* Memoirs of Watts and Doddridge, p. 140, Boston edition.

must worship him in spirit and in truth. John xvii. 17. *They word is truth.*

Alas! that christians should sit down to sing God's truth, and then stand up to sing their own tradition!

Let us no longer worship according to "the precept of men," but unite in the holy anthem of celestial praise. Rev. v. 13. Blessing and honor and glory and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.

To him that sits upon the throne,
Be honor, praise and glory given;
Loud hallelujahs to the Lamb,
By all on earth, and all in heaven.

CHAPTER III.

Containing an examination of the divine testimony respecting the NATURE AND ORIGIN of those perfections by which the Son of God created, governs, saves, and judges the world.

We have seen in Col. ii. 9, that in Jesus Christ "dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." A few verses before this, chap. i. 19, the inspired apostle informs us, "*it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell.*" Here then, the divine testimony teaches us that it is by the *pleasure of the Father*, that the Son possesses this divine fulness. It ought to be particularly observed, that this last passage is in immediate connexion with the 16th and 17th verses, which declare him to have created all things, and to be before all things. This must certainly refer to his *highest character*. It consequently teaches us, that he possesses his *highest and most glorious perfections* by the pleasure of the Father. The apostle represents even saints being "filled with all the fulness of God," Eph. iii. 19. This, indeed, must be understood as vastly inferior to the fulness which Christ possesses. The creation of the universe is ascribed to the Son. John i. iii. Col. i. 16, &c. But do the scriptures of truth teach us that he created all things by his own *independent* power, or that he was the glorious agent of "the only true God?" Eph. iii. 9.—God, who created all things by Jesus Christ. Heb. i. 12. God—hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, by whom also HE made the worlds.

These passages certainly teach us that it was by the *power of the Father*, that the Son created the worlds. His creating all things, therefore, affords no proof that he is omnipotent.

In Heb. i. 3. Jesus Christ is represented as "upholding all things by the word of his power." Certainly this must be in his *highest character*. Yet the apostle explains this by informing us that he was *made* so much better than the angels.

In Acts ii. 22, all the miracles which the Savior wrought on earth are ascribed to the *power of the Father*. "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs which *God did by him* in the midst of you. In Matt. xxviii. 18, and John xvii. 2. All power in heaven and in earth is ascribed to Christ. Is not this descriptive of the *highest* power he possesses? Does he possess it *independently*? Let us hear and believe "the faithful witness." "All power is *GIVEN* unto me," &c. "As thou hast *GIVEN* him power over all flesh, that he should give *eternal life* to as many as thou hast given him." Here we are plainly taught that the whole power, by which the Son of God accomplishes the redemption of his church, is *given* him by the Father. Shall we then continue to say, that no *given* power, that nothing less than independent omnipotence can qualify him for such a work? Is, not this to say, that the means divine wisdom employs for the redemption of the elect are *inadequate*?

My respected brother Stuart, remarking on the character of Christ as *Judge*,* observes, "*omnipresence and omniscience only* can qualify him for the duties of that station." He admits that, "he does indeed *act* as judge by delegated authority." Let John xvii. 2, be again considered. Does not the giving "eternal life to the elect," include his *judging them and the world*? Or, if this should be denied; does it require any *more* wisdom, or knowledge, or power to *judge the world*, than it does to give *eternal life* to his people? Most certainly it does not. Here, then, it obviously appears from the divine testimony, that he is not only appointed to "*act* as judge, by delegated authority," but that the very *qualification* by which he acts, not only in the single office of *judging the world*; but in the arduous and glorious work of *giving eternal life* to his sheep, is *given* him by the Father. I do not perceive how Mr. Stuart can

*Letters to Mr. Channing, 3d Edit. p. 97.

reconcile the above observation with the following in his Letters to Mr. Miller :* "*I can conceive it possible, that a derived being may have such an unlimited communication of power, and knowledge, and wisdom, that he may govern worlds.*" He who governs worlds is surely competent to judge them.

We have seen from the words of the Lord, that our divine Redeemer is qualified for the important work appointed him, in respect to *wisdom and knowledge*. Col. ii. 3. "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." John ii. 25. He knew what was in man. Rev. ii. 23. I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts.

He is worthy to take the book of the divine counsels, and to unloose the seals thereof. He only reveals to us, and to the powers of the heavenly places, the purposes of Jehovah, unfolding to our admiring view, the works of grace and love and holy vengeance of "the only true God." And how doth he obtain this knowledge of all things? What saith the scripture? "The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him." Rev. i. 1.

Titus iii. 4—6. But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly THROUGH Jesus Christ our Savior. This passage, and many others, proves, that the Son saves us by the appointment and power of the Father. It also proves how erroneous that common idea is, that wherever the word *Savior* occurs in a text, the *Son of God* must be intended.

John viii. 26. He that sent me is true, and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him. John xii. 49, 50. For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, &c. John iii. 31, 32. He that cometh from heaven is above all, and what he hath seen and heard that he testifieth.

It appears equally evident from "the oracles of God," that Jesus Christ will judge the world, by the power and appointment of the Father. Acts x. 42. It is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. Rom. ii. 16. God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ. John v. 22. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.

Jer. xxiii. 6. it is said of the Son of God, "and this is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our righteousness." Jer. xxiii. 16, it is said of Jerusalem, "this is the name wherewith she shall be called, the Lord our righteousness," not because either the Son or people of Jehovah are literally Jehovah, but because, in them, Jehovah is pleased to accomplish his gracious purpose of salvation. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," &c. Even places where God displayed his power and goodness were called by his name. "Jehovah-jireh." "Jehovah-nissi."

When we contemplate the holy Son of God in the endearing character of the "one mediator between God and man," what a glory do we behold encircling him in all his offices!

As our PROPHET, he "spake as never man spake." His doctrine distilled as the dew. "Grace was poured into his lips." Psal. xlv. 2. Blessed teacher! The knowledge thou dost impart is life to our souls. Oh, may we never turn away from "him that speaketh from heaven."

As our PRIEST, how precious is his offering and intercession! We have the "remission of sins through his blood." He "ever liveth to make intercession for us." He is "made higher than the heavens;" "a great high priest, Jesus the Son of God."

As our KING, he is "fairer than the children of men." He is "King of kings and Lord of lords." By the power of his grace he conquers the hearts of his chosen seed, and subjects them to his righteous government. O blessed Prince of peace! O precious reign of grace! He will present his redeemed church before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. He shall triumph over all his foes, for he must reign until all his enemies are put under his feet. Those who will not have him to reign over them he will punish "with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Then shall he "be glorified in his saints, and admired in them that believe."

Let it however be remembered, that it is the Father who is "the only true God," that has exalted him, and upholds him in this high station. Deut. xlviii. 18. I will raise them up a Prophet, &c. As a Priest he is "made higher than the heavens." So Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee, Heb. v. 5. Psal. ii. 6. Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion.

The case of Joseph, who appears to have been a striking type of Christ, may serve to illustrate, in some manner, the scriptural representation of the glorious dignity of the Son of God, and also his dependence on the Father for all his authority. Gen. xli. 39—44. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph—thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, see I have set thee over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh took off his ring from his hand and put it on Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about this neck. And he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had, and they cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt.

Such was the high authority with which Pharaoh invested Joseph: in consequence of which, he was, in a sense, honored even as they honored Pharaoh; for it was said to him, "Thou art even as Pharaoh;" Gen. xli. 18. Joseph was exalted to the government of Egypt; and was indeed more actively ruler, than Pharaoh himself. Yet Pharaoh was greater than Joseph. From Pharaoh he derived all his dignity, and on his sovereign will he was dependent for all his authority. Pharaoh *governed* Egypt by Joseph. Pharaoh *saved* Egypt during the famine by Joseph. He gave him a name, said to signify a Savior, and commanded all to bow the knee to Joseph.

So "the eternal Spirit," who is and ever must be the alone God, creates, upholds, governs and saves by his Son, "whom he hath appointed heir of all things," whom he hath "*made* better than the angels;" and whom, on account of all judgment being *committed* to him, he requires us to honor even as we honor the Father. I have no idea that the case of Joseph, or any other, can present to the mind an adequate parallel of the incomparable Immanuel.

"Nor earth, nor seas, nor sun, nor stars,
"Nor heaven his full resemblance bears;
"His beauties we can never trace,
"Till we behold him face to face."

Far be it from us to rob the Savior of his true glory. Far be it from us to deny his own testimony. Let us not be found uniting with the Jews in charging "the

faithful witness," with advancing claims to a character he never assumed: a charge which Jesus himself immediately repelled in the plainest language. John v. 19. How delusive is the impression, that we are honoring the Son of God while we deny his own testimony?

Let none, however, imagine, that we can have too exalted views of the sinner's friend, that we can adore him too highly, or love him too ardently, while in accordance with the inspired testimony, we behold him as "the *image* of the invisible God;" and worship him "to the glory of God the Father." Let our minds expand to the utmost stretch of thought in the contemplation of his divine beauty and glorious dignity; still our conceptions of his incomparable excellence will be vastly too limited and inadequate. Let our hearts glow with the most fervent love, and our bosoms heave with the warmest gratitude to his dear name, still we must acknowledge that our affections towards him bear no proportion to his charms or his love. With our highest notes of praise, we must mingle the sigh of lamentation, that we admire and love and praise him no more.

"Had we a thousand lives to give,
A thousand lives should all be thine."

CHAPTER IV.

Containing an examination of the divine testimony respecting the import of the term Son of God, and whether it is, or is not expressive of the HIGHEST character of our blessed Lord.

It has long been a sentiment of very general belief in the christian church, that the terms *Son of God*, *only begotten Son of God*, are expressive of that divine relation to the Father in which his *highest character* consists. These terms are now considered by some, who are to be respected for their talents and piety, as referable to the humanity of Christ peculiarly begotten; and not as importing his most exalted nature.

In relation to this interesting and important subject, we may consider the following truths derived from the divine testimony.

1. It is in the character of the Son or God, that the Sa-

vior is presented to a lost world, as the great object of faith, and with the belief of this truth salvation is connected.

2. It is in this character, he is an object of worship.

3. Jesus Christ during his ministry on earth never claimed a higher title.

4. The highest title ever given him in the scriptures of truth, even that of God, is given to him as the *Son of God*.

If these propositions are clearly supported by the word of God, can we possibly avoid the conclusion, that the terms under consideration import the highest character of our Redeemer?

1. That "the Lord from heaven," is presented to a perishing world as the great and glorious *object of faith* in the character of the *SON OF GOD*, with the belief of which truth salvation is connected, appears from the following passages. Matt. iii. 17. xvii. 5. John i. 34. iii. 18. 36. vi. 69. ix. 35. xi. 27. Acts viii. 37. ix. 20. Rom. i. 4. 1 John iv. 15, &c.

2. That it is in this character he is worshiped, plainly appears from Heb. i. 6. When he bringeth in the *first begotten* into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him. See also John v. 23. Matt. xiv. 33. John ix. 35. 38.

3. No passage can be found in which "the faithful witness" ever claimed a higher title. On this high claim, the charge of blasphemy by his opposers was founded. John x. 36. This claim excited their utmost rage. John v. 18.

4. That it is as the *SON OF GOD* on the throne of the mediatorial kingdom, he is called *God*, is evident from Heb. i. 8. Ps. xlv. 6. But unto the *Son*, he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.

The first chapter to the Hebrews illustrates this important truth. It is manifestly the design of the inspired apostle in this chapter, to set forth our adorable Redeemer in his highest dignity and most glorious character. He represents him, verse 2, as the maker of the worlds. Ver. 3. as the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person. Ver. 4. as being much better than the angels. Ver. 6. as the object of their worship. And ver. 8. as God. But it appears from verses 2 and 3, that it was in the character of *Son* that he made the worlds. If, then, his creating the world, if his being "the express image" of the invisible God, denote his divine nature, the title of *Son* must denote the same. Why is he made so much better than the angels? Because he hath by inher-

itance obtained a more excellent name than they. But what is this excellent name? It is the *Son of God*. This is evident from ver. 5. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, thou art my *Son*, &c. But if this name is applicable only to his humanity, it must rather signify that he was made "*a little lower than the angels*;" and the inspired apostle appears wholly to have failed in his proof, ver. 5, which he evidently considers as conclusive.

Mr. Fuller in his essay on this subject, justly remarks, "The glory of the *only begotten of the Father*, and the glory of the *Word*, are used as convertible terms, as being the same: but the latter is allowed to denote the divine person of Christ, antecedent to his being made flesh; the same therefore must be true of the former. *The word was made flesh, and we beheld his glory*; that is, the glory of the *Word*, the *glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth*. John i. 14."

John iii. 16. For God so loved the world, that he gave his *only begotten Son*, &c. Here the apostle exhibits to us the great love of the giver, by setting forth the excellence of the gift. But all this excellence is comprised in the phrase, "*his only begotten Son*." This phrase must, therefore, include the *highest character* of our blessed Redeemer, or it is totally inadequate for the apostle's purpose, to set forth the amazing love of God towards us in "his unspeakable gift."

Heb. iv. 14.—We have a *great high priest*, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the *Son of God*. "The blood of Jesus Christ *his Son* cleanseth us from all sin." If, then, there is any divinity in his priesthood, to give virtue to his sacrifice and intercession, that divinity is in the name of the *Son of God*.

So also, when he is exalted as King on the holy hill of Zion, the decree is declared, "Thou art my *Son*," &c. And when we are required to be reconciled to his government, we are commanded to "kiss the *Son*." Psalm ii. 7. 12.

John xvii. 5. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. The obvious truth in this passage is, that the *Son* possessed glory with the Father "before the world was," and, consequently, that these relations then subsisted. But if the term "*Son of God*," is not expressive of the Redeemer's *highest character*, it follows that the Son of God, so far from possessing glory with the Father before the world was, has not yet existed two thousand years!

It is remarked by the respected author before quoted, that "God is frequently said to have *sent* his Son into the world. John vii. 18. x. 36. 1 John iv. 9, 10. But this implies that he was his Son antecedent to his being sent. To suppose otherwise, is no less absurd than supposing that when Christ is said to have sent forth his twelve disciples, they were not disciples, but in consequence of his sending them, or of some preparation pertaining to their mission." "Moreover, to say that *God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh*, is equal to saying, that the Son of God assumed human nature: he must therefore have been the Son of God before his incarnation. Christ is called the Son of God antecedent to his being *manifested to destroy the works of the devil*: but he was manifested to destroy the works of the devil by taking upon him human nature: consequently he was the Son of God antecedent to the human nature being assumed."

"It has been frequently suggested, that the ground of Christ's sonship is given us in Luke i. 35, and is no other than his miraculous conception. It is true that our Lord was miraculously conceived of the Holy Spirit, and that such a conception was peculiar to him; but it does not follow, that by this he became the *Son, or only begotten Son of God*. Nor does the passage in question prove any such thing. It may be a reason given why Christ is *called* the Son of God; but not why he *is* so. Christ is called the Son of God as raised from the dead, and as exalted at the right hand of God. Acts xiii. 33. Heb. i. 4, 5. Did he then become the Son of God by these events? This is impossible; for sonship is not a progressive matter. If it arose from his miraculous conception, it could not for that reason arise from his resurrection or exaltation: and so on the other hand, if it arose from his resurrection, or exaltation, it could not proceed from his miraculous conception. But if each be understood of his being hereby *proved, acknowledged*, or, as the scriptures express it, '*declared to be the Son of God with power*,' all is easy and consistent."

Rom. i. 3, 4, is an instructive passage. Our Lord was "made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness," &c. It is admitted by learned Trinitarians that "it is not the third person in the Trinity that is referred to here." (See Barnes, Poole, &c. on the passage.) It is Christ's spirit in contrast with his body. He was of the seed of David in respect to his flesh or body. Observe,

not according to his flesh and *human soul*, but simply in respect to his *flesh, or body*. "A body, (not body and soul) hast thou prepared me." "The Word was made flesh," not flesh and soul. But "according," or, in respect, to his spirit, he was "the Son of God." The passage proves that he was so *before* his incarnation. Mr. Barnes observes, "The expression *according to the spirit of holiness* does not indeed of itself imply divinity. It denotes that *holy* and more *exalted nature* which he possessed as distinguished from the human." The distinction, however, in the passage, is not between *two spirits* of different natures, but simply between the nature and origin of his one holy spirit and the nature and origin of that flesh or body which that spirit assumed.*

We have, then, sufficient proof from the divine testimony, that the term Son of God is expressive of the highest character of our Savior. The reflecting reader will discern that we have equal proof that he is, in his highest nature, "the *only begotten* of the Father," and must, therefore, be necessarily *dependent* on him for all things, agreeably to Christ's own words; "all things are *delivered* unto me of my Father." Mr. Fuller, although a Trinitarian,

* My esteemed brother Barnes remarks, on Rom. i. 4. "The natural idea of the term Son of God therefore is, that he sustained a relation to God in his nature which implied more than was human or angelic; which implied *equality* with God." That the terms "The Son of God" and "only begotten," imply a nature superior to the human and angelic, is obvious. But how does it follow that his nature must be that of supreme deity? Is it impossible for God to create or beget any intelligent being of a higher nature than that of the angelic? Mr. B. adds "this idea (i. e. of equality) was naturally suggested to the Jews by his calling God his Father, John v. 18." Whether their inference was natural or not it was certainly *untrue*, "the faithful witness" himself bring judge, for Jesus Christ immediately repudiated their inferential accusation by the avowal, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do *nothing* of himself," &c. Let me ask that respected and intelligent author whether the term Son does not "naturally" suggest the idea of "begotten?" Is not the idea of *begotten* inseparable from the idea of Son? Do not the Scriptures of truth plainly and positively declare that Jesus Christ, *as the Son of God, is begotten*? Once more permit me to ask, does not the term begotten naturally suggest the idea of *derivation*? It is admitted that the nature of Jehovah is *underived and unbegotten*. How then can a term which naturally suggests the idea of *derivation* naturally suggest the idea of *self-existence*? If it cannot, (as is obvious to common sense,) it cannot naturally suggest the idea of perfect "equality" with God. The manifest truth is, that the term, "The only begotten Son of God," naturally suggests, to every unbiased mind, the idea of a distinct being from the alone God; dependent upon him for his existence, but a partaker of the divine nature in a peculiar and pre-eminent manner and degree.

acknowledged in the conclusion of his essay on the Sonship of Christ, that "in the order of nature, the Father must have existed *before the Son*."* He indeed supposed the Son to be "properly eternal," as well as the Father. But to reconcile this idea with the above concession, is, to me at least, absolutely impossible.

Is this, with any of us a subject of mere speculation?—God forbid! In this name, my brethren, is concentrated all the glory of God ever viewed by mortal minds. In this name centers all our hope, and peace, and joy. It is this dear name that draws forth our souls to Jehovah, in wonder, love and praise. This is the blest name that comprises all those glorious "things the angels desire to look into." And it is in the knowledge, love and adoration of this name that the saints shall be "filled with all the fulness of God."

"Oh, may I live to reach the place,
Where he unveils his lovely face;
Where all his beauties you behold,
And sing his name to harps of gold."

CHAPTER V.

Containing an examination of the divine testimony concerning Jesus Christ, as the OBJECT OF FAITH.

It is undoubtedly our duty and privilege to believe *every part* of the divine record respecting the Son of God. But we are particularly to observe in what character he is presented to a lost world as the *object of faith*, and what we are required to believe in order to be saved.

John iii. 16. For God so loved the world that he gave his *only begotten Son*, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. 18. He that believeth on him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already; because he hath not believed in the name of the *only begotten Son of God*. 36. He that believeth on the *Son* hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the *Son* shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him. John ix. 35. Jesus—said unto him, dost thou believe on the *Son of God*? Acts viii. 37. I be-

* Dialogues, Letters and Essays, on various subjects, page 134 Hartford edition.

lieve that Jesus Christ is the *Son of God*. Acts ix. 20. And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the *Son of God*. John xx. 31. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the *Son of God*; and that believing ye might have life through his name. 1 John iv. 15. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the *Son of God*, God dwelleth in him and he in God. "These things have I written unto you that believe in the name of the *Son of God*, that ye may know that ye have eternal life; and that ye may believe on the name of the *Son of God*." Is it not a truth, shining with peculiar luster in the divine word, that Jesus Christ is presented to a perishing world as the *grand object of faith*, in the character of the *SON OF GOD*?

When the heavens are opened, that the character of the Savior may be announced by the Majesty on high to a perishing world, what do we hear? This is the second person of the adorable Trinity! This is the supreme God! No; but, "this is *my beloved Son*, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." And what did the blessed Ambassador of peace require? "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" This great truth was indeed the dividing line between his disciples and the world. The former believed, and were saved; the latter denied, and perished. As Jesus never *claimed* a higher character than this; he never required his disciples to *believe* that he possessed any higher character. It was the spiritual revelation of this great truth to the apostle Peter that rendered him blessed. And it was the confession, not that Jesus was the supreme God, or the second in a Trinity of equal persons; but, "*thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God*," which received the benediction of his Lord. Matt. xvi. 16, 17.

Shall we then be dissatisfied with a confession which the Savior himself approved? Shall we add to the divine testimony? Or shall we contradict that testimony and say, whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the *Son of God*, God doth not dwell in him and he in God, unless he doth also confess that Jesus Christ is that *very God* whose *Son* he is declared to be?

It is indeed important to observe, that true and saving faith in the *character of the Son of God*, implies a holy belief of his testimony respecting the perfections of God, the purity and reasonableness of his Law; the exceeding sinfulness of man as a rebel against the divine government; the way of salvation, through the perfect obedience of Jesus

Christ unto death; and the necessity of the fruits of holiness, "without which no man shall see the Lord."

Awful is the delusion, and dreadful will be the doom of all those who rest in a mere profession of the truth, that Jesus is the Son of God. Their condemnation is already declared. "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: For thy heart is not right in the sight of God." Acts viii. 21.

If, then, we admit that we are required to believe in the highest character of the Savior, in order to be saved by him; we must admit that the term Son of God, in that peculiar sense in which it is applied to Christ, is expressive of that character.

CHAPTER VI.

Containing an examination of the divine testimony concerning the Son of God as a distinct being from the Father.

It is indeed revealed that Christ and his Father are one. John v. 30. But it is no where revealed that the Father and Son are one being. In the very next verse preceding the declaration, "I and my Father are one," Jesus said, "My Father—is greater than all." Jesus also prayed, John xvii. 21, that his disciples "may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us."

Do not all those passages which declare that Christ "came down from heaven;" "from God;" that the Father sent him; evidently imply that he was a distinct being in that very highest character in which only he existed "with God" in heaven, before he "came down from heaven?" If the Spirit of truth has used the language of mortals, in the sense it is invariably used and understood by mortals; can these passages fail to produce the conviction, that he who "came down from heaven," "from God," who was sent by the Father, was, and is a distinct being from the Father who sent him? Is it possible to conceive of the Son coming down from heaven, rather than the Father, if they are both "the same numerical essence?" Or, is it possible to conceive of the Word being "made flesh," rather than the Father, if we conceive of both as one being?

It has been suggested by a late able writer, that the pas-

sages which speak of God's sending his Son, &c. are to be understood as referring to the Father's sending him *after he was born of the virgin*, to execute the mediatorial office. The scriptural representation is, that the Father sent him "into the world." John iii. 17, &c. Besides, if the opinion of that writer is correct, that Christ, as the Son of God, did not exist previous to the incarnation; we certainly must expect never to read of any character inferior to the supreme God coming "down from heaven."

Let us now attend to "the faithful witness." John vi. 38. For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. John vi. 33. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. John viii. 42. I proceeded forth, and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. John xiii. 3. Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God. John xvi. 28. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world and go to the Father. Well did his disciples say, "Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb."

How manifest from these words of the disciples, is the truth, that they were not Trinitarians. Had they understood our Lord to say, that "the same numerical essence" came forth from "the same numerical essence," would they have said, "Lo, now speakest thou plainly," &c.? Must they not have said, as Trinitarians say, Thou speakest an incomprehensible mystery?

Heb. x. 5. Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me, &c.* 7. Then said I, Lo, I

* A body hast thou prepared me." Not a body and another spirit or soul. "The Word was made flesh." This is the divine testimony on this important subject. The common opinion, that the Son of God took another "reasonable soul" is sustained by no declaration of the Bible. "The first born of every creature," the "first begotten" was a spirit, "the image of the invisible God." This spirit, or Word, was made flesh, i. e. united to the body "prepared" for him, and, in connection therewith, humbled himself, was "made like unto his brethren." He became susceptible of our feelings and infirmities, was tempted in all points as we are; but without sin; that he might know how to succor them that are tempted. That it was possible for the Son of God incarnate thus to humble himself and to be qualified to sympathize with us; as our faithful High Priest, without assuming an additional spirit of the human nature; and that the assumption of a human body in connection with such humiliation of spirit furnishes adequate ground for his being called man, the Son of man, &c. no one can reasonably deny.

come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) *to do thy will, O God*. How plain and forcible is this divine testimony! Is not the last quoted declaration of Christ, represented as being *previous* to his actually being in the flesh? Was it not the declaration of the *Word* that "was with God," and "was made flesh?" And is it not the language of *inferiority and subjection*? Here are *two distinct wills* spoken of *before the incarnation*. The will of the *Son*, in subjection to the will of the *Father*. Could the "Word" in truth say, "*I come to do thy will, O God*," rather than his own: or could he afterwards say, "*I came down from heaven*, not to do mine own will," if his will was *the same numerical will* with that of the Father? Surely, then, we are plainly taught in the unerring word of truth, that he who came down from heaven to do the will of God, was and is, in his highest character, a *distinct being* from him whose will he voluntarily came to do.

John xvii. 5. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. Is not the glory, which Christ here prayed for, and for which, consequently, he acknowledges his dependence on the Father, the glory of his *highest nature*? This is certainly the case; for in his highest nature only did he exist "before the world was." But if the Word was *ever* dependent on the Father for his highest glory, he must have been *always* dependent; for supreme independence is *immutable*. This prayer of Jesus Christ, therefore, proves that the Word is a *distinct being* from the Father. After this prayer was answered, and Jesus glorified with the same glory he had with the Father before the world was, he is still distinguished from God in the following passages: Rom. i. 7. 1 Cor. i. 3. xi. 3. 1 Thes. iii. 11. 2 Thes. iii. 5. ii. 16, &c.

2 Cor. viii. 9. For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he *was rich*, yet for your sakes he *became poor*, &c. Here the inspired apostle refers to the glory of the Son of God before he was made flesh. Moved with compassion for us, he laid aside this glory; "*he became poor*." Surely this cannot, in any sense, be applicable to the *immutable Jehovah*.

1 Cor. viii. 6. But to us there is but *ONE GOD, THE FATHER*, of whom are all things, and we in him; and *one Lord Jesus Christ*, by whom are all things, and we by him. Is it possible for any language to prove more explicitly that there is no trinity of persons in the one God, than this? Here we are plainly taught, not only that there

is but one God, but that this one God is "*THE FATHER*." Alas! we have still to say with the apostle, "Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge;" for some with conscience say to us, the Father alone, is not the one God. The one God, is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Here, then, are *two different testimonies* concerning the only living and true God. And which shall we believe? The one inspired by the Holy Ghost; or that which is declared by fallible men? Is there a single passage of scripture which declares that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God? Or that there are three persons in the Godhead? Or that the Father alone is not the one God? If the doctrine of the Trinity were true, should we not find it clearly declared, in at least one passage? The text in 1 John v. 7. (if it were not an interpolation,) does not declare either expressly or implicitly, that the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost are one God, or one being, or one person, or three persons: but simply "these three are one." In *what sense* they are one, must certainly be determined by other passages of scripture. How plainly is the one Lord Jesus Christ, "*by whom are all things*," distinguished from the one God, "*or whom are all things*." And how perfectly does this harmonize with other parts of the divine testimony. "God who created all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. iii. 9. By him he saves sinners, and manifests the glory of his grace, "to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places." Eph. iii. 10. By him he will judge the world. Acts xvii. 31. Eph. iv. 5, 6. Here again, the "one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all," is distinguished from the "one Lord."

Col. i. 15, 16. Who is the *image* of the invisible God, the *first born of every creature*; for by him were all things created, &c. Christ Jesus was the *image* of God, in his *highest nature*, for as such he created the world. Does not this expression teach us that he is a distinct being from the Father? Would the declaration, that a being is the *image of himself*, convey any intelligible idea to the mind? Is the word ever so used? Is not every image a representation of a *distinct object*? Is it not the likeness of *another thing*? If the scriptures revealed that the Son is the invisible God, would the apostle have said, he is the *image or likeness* of the invisible God? When one person bears a striking resemblance to another, we sometimes say, he who has seen one has seen the other. So did our Savior say, "he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father;" and with the greatest propriety; for "God who commanded the

light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of his glory *in the face of Jesus Christ.*"

"*The first born of every creature.*" The apostle proves that the Son of God is "the first born of every creature," by his creating all things. His argument is conclusive; for if "God — created all things by Jesus Christ," Jesus Christ must have existed "before all things." The passage also proves that he was the first born of every creature, *when he created all things*, otherwise, the latter could be no proof of the former. If we refer the phrase "first born of every creature," to his *humanity*, it makes the apostle argue very absurdly, that Jesus Christ is a man because he made all things. It is conceived that every unbiased mind must perceive that the apostle has as much reference to the highest nature of Christ, when he declares him to be *the first born of every creature*, as when he declares, that "by him were all things created." And we may as well say, it was his humanity that created all things, as to say, it was his humanity that was the first born of every creature. When it is said, that by him *all things* were created, it is manifest that he himself is excepted, who is "*the only begotten of the Father,*" and "the beginning of the creation of God." Rev. iii. 14.

John xvii. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, *the only true God*, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. Does not "the faithful witness" here plainly distinguish between himself, and "the only true God?" If Jesus Christ is the only true God, and man in one person, has he in this passage borne witness to the *truth*? Jude 4. Denying the *only Lord God*, and our Lord Jesus Christ. Here also our Savior is distinguished from the *only Lord God*. John vii. 17. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. John xiv. 1. Ye believe in God, believe also in me. Rom. i. 7. Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Titus ii. 13. Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Savior Jesus Christ. The scriptures assure us that the second coming of Christ will be attended with the manifestation of the "*glory of his Father,*" as well as the glory of the Son, and of the holy angels. Matt. xvi. 27. Rom. xvi. 27. To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen. Heb. xii. 23, 24. To God the judge of all — and to Jesus the mediator, &c. 1 Tim. ii. 5. For there is one God, and one mediator be-

tween God and men, the man Christ Jesus. Rev. i. 9. For the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. Rev. v. 13. Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. If Jesus Christ or the Lamb, is the very same being that sitteth upon the throne, is not the last clause superfluous and without meaning? Rev. xix. 13—16. Here our Savior is called the "Word of God," the "King of kings and Lord of lords." Are not these titles descriptive of his *very highest character*? Yet this King of kings and Lord of lords; this Word of God is plainly distinguished in the 15th verse, from the "*ALMIGHTY GOD.*" While we give to the Son of God the glory due to his name; let us receive his own testimony, that the Father is "the only true God;" "for of him, and through him, and to him, are all things, to whom be glory for ever. Amen."

CHAPTER VII.

Containing an examination of the divine testimony respecting the INFERIORITY of the highest character of the Son to that of the Father.

John xiv. 28. My Father is greater than I. The views of some of our dear christian brethren oblige them to consider this declaration as referring to the mediatorial character of Jesus Christ, in distinction from his highest nature. This is conceding that Jesus Christ, *as mediator*, is not the supreme God; consequently, the argument, that he must be the supreme God in order to be a *competent mediator*, and to make an *adequate atonement*, is given up. Let it, however, be seriously considered, whether Jesus Christ could in truth say this, if he is supreme God and man in *one person*. Must not the pronoun I, in reference to that one person, necessarily include *all the attributes* of that *one person*, if Jesus Christ makes no distinction here between one nature and another, nor between a lower and higher character? The connection of the passage, clearly shows, that our Savior here spoke in reference to his *highest character*. "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto my Father, for my Father is greater than I." Does not Jesus here teach his disciples, that they ought to rejoice because he was going to enjoy a happier state, and that his felicity in the society of his Father, would arise from *the superior glory of the Father*? Does not the connexion plainly teach, that the Father would be greater

than the Son *in that state to which he was going?* If we do not admit this, the whole force and propriety of the passage is destroyed. If it is admitted, it proves the *inferiority* of the Son, in his *highest nature*; for as certainly as his prayer was answered, John xvii. 5. he was immediately glorified with the glory he had with the Father "*before the world was,*" which was the glory of his divine nature.

John x. 27—29. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. If Jesus Christ is the supreme God, could he add anything to this declaration to show the perfect and eternal security of his sheep? Yet he adds, "My Father which *gave* them to me, *is greater than all*; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." Is it not in his *highest nature and character* that the Son of God gives his sheep eternal life? And does he not in the most unequivocal manner testify, that he is in *that nature and character* inferior to the Father? If, however, we suppose Jesus Christ *did not* here speak of himself in his highest nature, (for which supposition I cannot perceive the least shadow of evidence,) still according to the doctrine of the Trinity, he could not say, "My Father — is greater than *all*;" for, according to that doctrine, the Father is neither greater than the Word, or the Holy Spirit, who are considered *distinct persons* from him.

John v. 17—23. Here we find the unbelieving Jews charging the holy Jesus with "making himself equal with God," because he said, "that God was his Father." Did Jesus Christ admit their inference to be a just one? Let us again hear "the faithful witness" in his answer to this charge: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son *can do nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do."* There can be no reasonable doubt that the *highest nature and character* of the Son was here the subject of dispute. At the very same time that Jesus in the most solemn, plain and positive manner, declared his entire dependence on his Father, he assures us he is to be *honored as the Father* on account of all judgment being *committed* to him: which honor and worship is certainly to be paid to his highest character.

John x. 30. 38. Here the Jews charged our blessed Redeemer with blasphemy, and with making himself God, be-

* Was this suffering the mistake of the Jews to pass "uncorrected?" See a Sermon by Mr. Thomas Baldwin, on the deity of Christ, page 14.

cause he said unto them, "I and my Father are one:" notwithstanding Jesus in the very next verse before, had assured them that his Father was "*greater than all.*" But let us hear the reply of the Savior: "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father" — what? declares to be the supreme God, or the second in a trinity of equal persons? No; but "whom the *Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world*, thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the *Son of God?*" Observe that the highest title Jesus here claimed or indeed ever claimed in his conferences with the Jews is *the Son of God*.

Mr. Stuart supposes that the term *Son of God* is not expressive of the highest nature of our Lord, and admits that the Jews misconstrued the words of Christ on these occasions. He represents that "prudence would not permit" of "his advancing claims to a truly divine character" on these occasions. But how does this sentiment agree with the fact that what he did say enraged them so much, that they sought to kill him immediately by stoning? As Jesus "knew what was in man," he must have known that his advancing the claim of being "the son of God," would actually produce the same effect in their minds, as if he had really claimed to be "equal with God:" for this was the fact, and their utmost rage was excited. It is equally evident, that they were in no more favorable condition to hear with candor the claims Jesus did advance, than to hear and examine claims to a higher character. It appears to me, therefore, that the motive which Mr. Stuart supposes to have influenced our Savior to withhold his testimony to his highest character on this occasion did not exist.*

One of the declarations of our Lord, which occasioned the charge of the Jews, was, "I and my Father are one." Now, if he meant, as some suppose, that he and his Father are *one being*, the Jews did not misconstrue his words; but then it would have been necessary for Jesus to have supported this sense of the passage by a very different reason than that *the Father had sanctified and sent him into the world*; which is the language of dependence and inferiority, and can never be construed to afford any argument in favor of supreme divinity. A Trinitarian would argue,

* Letters to Miller, pages 145—148.

Jesus Christ and the Father are one, because they are "the same numerical essence," or because they are equal persons in the Godhead; and if this were true, no doubt Jesus Christ would have argued in the same manner. The holy Son of God is perfectly one with the Father, i. e. united with him in the glorious work of redeeming love, and in everything appertaining to the divine government. It is impossible for me to reconcile the solemn asseveration, that "the Son can do nothing of himself," with either "prudence" or truth; (considering that Jesus said this, when his highest character was the subject of disputation, and when he claimed to be honored in some sense as the Father;) without believing that he is, *in his most exalted nature, inferior to the Father.*

Suppose a number of persons were now assembled to discuss the important subject under consideration. Some affirm, and others deny that Jesus Christ is the supreme God. Suppose "the faithful witness" himself should come into this assembly, and say, "*Verily, verily, the Son can do nothing of himself;*" would not this suffice to terminate the discussion? My brethren, the words of Jesus Christ must determine the point, whether we admit that determination or not.

Matt. xx. 23. To sit on my right hand, and on my left, *is not mine to give*; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father. Matt. xxvi. 53. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels. John xiv. 13. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name that will I do, *that the Father may be glorified in the Son.* John viii. 49—58. I honor my Father, &c. I seek not mine own glory.—If I honor myself, my honor is nothing: it is my Father that honoreth me. I know him and keep his saying.—Before Abraham was I am. The last declaration which certainly refers to the *highest* character of the Savior, is in immediate connection with the preceding expressions of *inferiority* to the Father, and manifestly teaches us that *the very same nature* that was before Abraham is *dependent on the Father*, and in all things seeks, as his first object, his Father's honor and not his own. Jesus does not give the Jews the least intimation, whereby they might understand that in one sentence he referred to one nature, and in another sentence to a different nature.

Mark xiii. 32. But of that day, and that hour knoweth no man, no not the *angels* which are in heaven, neither the *Son*

but the *FATHER.* Observe here the gradation in the scale of being: Man, Angels, Son, Father. It is easy, indeed, to say that the Savior did not know of that day as *man*, but he knew it as *God*. But for the truth's sake, let us first reflect what *authority* we have for saying this. Did Jesus Christ say this? Certainly if this were the truth, it was perfectly easy for the faithful and true witness to have declared it. Could his disciples have understood him in this sense? He first told them no *man* knew it; it would, therefore, have been a needless repetition to have added, "*neither the Son,*" if the import was *as man*. Surely this is one of the last passages in which we are to expect a repetition of ideas, where there is such a marked distinction in the scale of being. Besides, our Lord teaches us that the *Father only* knew of that day. But this is not true, if, as some suppose, the Father, Word, and Holy Spirit are three persons in one God; for, according to this, the Word or Son knew it equally with the Father. It makes no difference whether we consider the term *Word* or *Son*, as the distinctive appellation in the Godhead; in either case, it would still be untrue that the Father *only* knew of that day. Here, then, we have the testimony of Jesus himself, that he is, in his highest nature, *inferior to the Father in knowledge.* We have also the same divine testimony, John v. 19. John xvii. 2. Matt. xxviii. 18, &c. that he is *inferior to him in power.* He has indeed, (as Mr. Stuart acknowledges a *derived* being may have) "such an unlimited communication of power and knowledge and wisdom, that he may govern worlds." He knows all things, in a vastly higher sense than Christians "know all things." 1 John ii. 20.

John vi. 38. For I came down from heaven, *not to do mine own will*, but the will of him that sent me. Jesus Christ does not say he entered "upon the duties of any public office," not to do his own will, &c. but *I came down from heaven*, not to do mine own will, &c. It is indeed said of John the Baptist, as Mr. S. remarks, "there was a man sent from God;" and "the same came to witness," &c. But was it ever said of John, or any other prophet but Jesus Christ, that he "*came down from heaven*?" Surely, then, these words of our dear Redeemer, which fully express *inferiority* to the Father, must be referred to the *WORD*, which "was with God" before he was made flesh. Mr. S. indeed, implicitly admits that Christ's being *sent* by the Father refers to his highest nature; for he considers the terms "*sending and being sent,*" as proof of distinct persons in

the Godhead.* Will Mr. S. affirm that these terms furnish more proof of distinct *persons* than they do of distinct *beings*?

Heb. 1st chap. We have already remarked, that the design of the apostle in this chapter, is to exhibit the Son of God in his highest nature and most glorious character. In order to excite the attention of the Hebrews to Him who is "the body" of all those ceremonies and sacrifices which were only the "shadows of good things to come;" he rejoices to set him forth in his unrivalled glory above all other creatures. But the inspired writer as clearly teaches us, that for these high titles and perfections the Son is *dependent* on the Father, and *inferior* to him. Is he "heir of all things?" He is "appointed" such by the Father. Has he "made the worlds?" It was the *Father* who made the worlds by him. Is he "better than the angels?" He is "made" so by the Father. Is he the Son of God, the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person? He is the "*first begotten*" of the Father. Is he the object of angelic worship? It is by the *command* of the Father. Is he called *God*? It is as "*the Son*," who is *begotten* of the Father, who is declared to be *his God*, and to have anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows.

Dear christian brethren, let us not be so positive that our present views are correct, as to prevent our perceiving the true import of the divine testimony, endeavoring only to reconcile that testimony with our system. Let us feel that it is *possible* at least, that our system may be erroneous; and that the opposition we feel to a particular doctrine, may arise from *wrong inferences* drawn from that doctrine. It is indeed easy to *say*, that every passage relating to Christ which expresses *inferiority*, refers to his human nature. But shall we say this without any regard to the connection of truth, in manifest violation of the testimony of the Holy Spirit in that connection? Is it not a violation of scripture and reason, to refer those passages which clearly teach the inferiority of the Son *in that state in which he existed before his incarnation*, to a nature which had then no existence? The word of truth plainly shews us that when he made the worlds, he was used as the *grand agent* of the Father. Heb. i. 2. Eph. iii. 9. That he enjoyed glory with the Father *before the world was*, for which he was de-

* Letters to Mr. Channing, page 36, 3d edition.

pendent on the Father. John xvii. 5. And that before he "was made flesh," his own will was perfectly subjected to that of his Father. Ps. xl. 7, 8.

My esteemed brother Stuart, of whose sincere desire to advocate the pure truth of God, I have no doubt, makes some remarks on this chapter, which I desire, "in the spirit of meekness," to notice. He admits that the same person who is called God, here calls another person his God; and observes, that "as the Messiah, the anointed King, he might, with the greatest propriety call Jehovah his God; for as Messiah he is to be considered as incarnate; and of course *subordinate*." Now let it be candidly considered, whether it is not as "*the anointed King*," that he is called *God* in the 45th Psalm, which is quoted in the first chapter to the Hebrews? It is evident to me that the term God is here used as a *relative title*, signifying his glorious dominion and high authority in that very mediatorial kingdom in which he is acknowledged to be *subordinate*. If so, is there not the same evidence, that as *God* he is subordinate, as that he is so as Messiah or anointed King? And is not this the obvious import of the passage, if read without regard to any system? "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the scepter of thy kingdom is a right scepter. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest iniquity; therefore God, *thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." The objection which may be made to his being *called God*, unless he is *supreme Deity*, vanishes, when we consider that the same title is applied to rulers of a vastly inferior order. Ps. lxxxii. 1, &c.

Must not all the prayers of our Lord be considered as proof of his dependence on the Father, in respect even to his highest nature? How can we account for his always praying to the *Father*, rather than to the *Word*, if both are perfectly equal? Or rather, how can we account for his praying at all, if he was the supreme God and man in one person? Did Martha believe that she was addressing the *eternal God*, when she said, "I know that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee?"

John x. 17, 18. Here Jesus declares he had power to lay down his life, and power to take it again. Must not this be the power of his *highest nature*? Yet he adds, "*this commandment (commission*) have I received of my Father*." John v. 26. For as the Father hath life in him-

* G. Campbell.

self, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. I do not know any passage, referable to Christ, which expresses anything like self-existence so much as this. If he is supreme God and man in one person, why did he not say, as the Father hath life in himself, so hath the Son life in himself? But how careful is "the faithful witness" to assure us, that the life he has in himself, is *given him of the Father*. If he was supreme Deity, could he need life from another? Let the serious enquirer after truth, read this passage and the connection, from the 19th to the 30th verses, and he will observe that the very same person who is to be honored as the Father, and who is to raise the dead declares, "I can of mine own self do nothing. I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me."

Phil. ii. 6. This passage is urged with the greatest confidence, as conclusive proof of the supreme Deity of Christ; as if the term "equal" is never used but in the most literal and unlimited sense. But is this the case? Ps. lv. 13. David speaks of "a man mine equal." Now, whoever this person was, he certainly was not *perfectly* equal with the king. So Luke xx. 36. The saints in glory are said to be "equal unto the angels;" but surely this cannot mean *perfect* equality.

But it is conceded by pious and learned christians of different sentiments, that our translation of this passage is neither a just expression of the sense of the original, nor consistent with the scope of the apostle's reasoning. Mr. Doddridge in his Family Expositor, considers the words "to be equal with God" as an improper translation: and that they ought to be rendered, "*to be and appear as God.*" "So, (he remarks) *ὡς Θεὸς* is most exactly rendered, agreeably to the force of *ὡς* in many places in the Septuagint, which Dr. Whitby has collected in his note on this place. The proper Greek phrase for *equal to God* is *ὡς τῷ Θεῷ*, which is used, John v. 18. Mr. Pierce thus paraphrases the clause before us, "He was not eager in retaining that likeness to God," of which he was before possessed."

The learned Macknight in his translation of the Epistles, agrees with Doddridge. He renders the passage, "*To be like God.*" So (he says) *ὡς ὡς ὡς Θεὸς*, literally signifies. For Whitby hath proved in the clearest manner, that *ὡς* is used adverbially by the LXX. to express *likeness*, but not *equality*, the proper term for which is *ὡς*. So that if the apostle had meant to say, *equal with God*, the phrase

would have been *ὡς Θεὸς*, as we have it in John v. 18. *ὡς ἑαυτοῦ ποιῶν τῷ Θεῷ*, making himself equal with God." He farther remarks, "if *μὲν ὡς Θεὸς*, signifies the nature of God, and *ὡς Θεὸς*, the being equal with God, the apostle hath said of Christ, *Who having the same nature and perfections with God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God in nature and perfections.* But this is a tautology, which cannot be imputed to so accurate a writer as St. Paul."

The whole scope of this interesting testimony is inconsistent with the idea of *perfect equality*, which would certainly be *immutable*; whereas the apostle exhibits a *real and great change* in the condition of the Son of God as an example of humility to the Philippians. Let the same mind be in you which was in Jesus Christ, who being in the form (or "the image") of the invisible God, "thought not the being like God, a thing to be seized, or "a thing to be greedily sought or appropriated;" but made himself of no reputation, &c. "*He divested himself.*" *Ἐαυτοῦ ἐκένωσεν*, literally, *he emptied himself.*"* There was once an awful example of pride exhibited to the "powers in the heavenly places," by "the angels that kept not their first estate." But the counsels of redeeming love unfolded to the intelligent universe, the most affecting example of humility that ever was, or probably ever will be exhibited. He who "is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature," the well beloved, and only begotten Son of God, moved with compassion for our miserable race, "came down from heaven," "was made flesh." "He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," to declare the righteousness of God, "that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Thus he opened the door of our prison, and Justice permitted the Angel of mercy to enter, "to proclaim liberty to the captives." Oh, what love is here! He who was rich became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich. Here was *real* humility; not a mere *show or appearance of it*. What a spectacle was presented to the intelligent universe when the Son of God, "the first born of every creature," *actually* expired on the cross!

But does not all the beauty and glory of this affecting scene vanish, and does not all the force of the apostle's reasoning sink away, if we suppose that Jesus Christ never existed, *before* "he took upon him the form of a servant;" or if we suppose he existed only as the *supreme immutable*

* Macknight.

Jehovah? Can we possibly believe that the *real change of condition, the real humbling, or emptying of himself*, ascribed in the word of truth to the Son, in reference to his coming down from heaven, can ever be ascribed to him "with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning?" Can we believe that the supreme Deity "*made himself of no reputation*?" Does the inspired apostle teach us this? Does he not teach us that the *very same person* who humbled himself, is *exalted by God* as the reward of humiliation and suffering? Is not the worship offered him, "*to the glory of God the Father*?" If we read this portion of divine truth, unbiased by pre-conceived opinion, can we possibly avoid the conclusion, that the person who humbled himself, is a distinct being from him who exalted him as the reward of his humiliation? Or can we avoid the conclusion, that he who has the name *given* him, is a distinct being from him who *gave* him that name? Or, that he who is worshiped, is a distinct being from him, *for whose glory he is worshiped*? If Jesus Christ is the supreme Deity; who is that other being of whom the apostle speaks, *who exalted him, who gave him a name, and for whose glory he is worshiped*?

It is evident, that it was the *voluntary actual parting* with the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and for which he afterwards *prayed*; and in his unparalleled sufferings and death, that the real humility consisted, which the apostle exhibits to christians, as an example worthy, as far as possible, of their imitation.

Mr. Stuart supposes that Christ, as *supreme God*, "*made himself of no reputation*." Apparently convinced of the impropriety of such a sentiment, however, he adds, "Yet, how incompetent must these translations be! So far as Christ is the immutable God he cannot change; i. e. he cannot *divest himself* of his essential perfections," &c.* Here let it be noticed, that Mr. S. considers not only our *translation*, but the *original inspired truth* INCOMPETENT! He says the original "*means*, as we translate it, *made himself of no reputation*." I solemnly ask, must not that be an *unjustifiable* attachment to system, which influences us, when we are brought into the dilemma, either to charge our own system, or to charge the word of God with incompetency, to prefer the latter? I would ask that respected writer, was not Jesus *actually divested* of that glory

* Letters to Channing, p. 91, 3d edit.

which he prayed to be restored to him, John xvii. 5.† And where, I ask, is that example of humility which the apostle sets forth in such an affecting manner, if there was *no real change of condition*? Mr. S. observes, "he may veil the brightness of his glories for a time," &c. But does this representation accord with the scriptures of truth? Are we taught, that when the Son of God appeared, the glories of supreme Deity were veiled for a time? Or did mortals then behold "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," in a manner they never beheld it before? Was it not then that the glory of "the invisible God" shone with such excellent luster that even the angels desired to look into it? Let us then view the incarnate Son of God, not as "an intervening cloud" which obscures for a while the luster of the divine perfections, but rather as "the bright and morning Star," which reflects them with peculiar radiance.

1 Cor. xv. 24—28. Here the apostle exhibits to our view that solemn and interesting period, when our glorious King and Mediator, having reigned until all enemies are put under his feet, "shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power."—"Then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be ALL IN ALL." Let us examine this testimony as humble enquirers after truth. Are we not here taught, that the Son is a distinct being from the Father, and inferior to him? Is it possible for language to express this more explicitly? Could the inspired apostle have made such a declaration as this, if he had been taught by the Holy Spirit that the Son was "*God and man in one person for ever*?" Shall we say, that the Son, as it respects his humanity only, shall be subject? But why did not the inspired apostle say this? We have equal proof that something more than humanity will be subject to the Father, as we have that something more than humanity will accomplish all the arduous and glorious work of the mediatorial kingdom. The Son, the very same Son of God, who reigns and triumphs over all enemies, is to be subject to him who put all things under him. Here is a *person, a being*, subject to the eternal Majesty. If then, the Son is God and man in *one inseparable person*, who, and where is that person, that *being* of whom the apostle speaks, who is to be subject to him who is ALL IN ALL? Do we say that it is *the man Christ Jesus*? Is then the man Christ Jesus, to exist eternally as "*the*

Son," a distinct person or being from his highest nature, whatever that nature may be? We must certainly view him who is subject to the infinite Majesty, as a *distinct being*; or it is obvious, that our views have no accordance with those of the apostle. Moreover, if "the only true God" is *triune*, why did not the inspired writer assure us, that Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the *Father, Word and Holy Ghost*? How plainly does his testimony in this passage harmonize with that in another, "to us there is one God the *Father*?" While it is impossible for me to reconcile this part of divine truth with Trinitarian views, it appears perfectly harmonious with the analogy of truth. The glorious Spirit "called the Word of God;" "the only begotten Son of God;" "the first born of every creature," was made flesh, took the *body* prepared for him by the Father, accomplished the work given him to do on earth, and now in his glorified body, is "at the right hand of the Majesty on high," reigning until he hath put all enemies under his feet. Then shall he deliver up the kingdom to God, even the *FATHER*, and "put down all rule and all authority and power;" and thus be more manifestly subject to the Father, "that God may be *ALL IN ALL*."

Although the Son of God, who is King in Zion, is honored with appropriate titles of dignity and glory, he is distinguished from "the only true God," by the following titles of supremacy which belong to "the invisible God" alone.

Jehovah. Whose name *alone* is Jehovah. Ps. lxxxiii. 18.

The eternal God. Deut. xxxiii. 27.

Most high God. Mark v. 7. Dan. v. 18.

God alone. Ps. lxxxvi. 10. Isa. xxxvii. 16. Lord alone. Neh. ix. 6.

God of heaven. Dan. ii. 44.

Besides me there is no God. Isa. xlv. 6.

Who only hath immortality. 1 Tim. vi. 16.

The only true God. John xvii. 3.

The King eternal, immortal, invisible. 1 Tim. i. 17.

The only wise God. 1 Tim. i. 17.

Lord God omnipotent. Rev. xix. 6.

Blessed and only Potentate. 1 Tim. vi. 15.*

* If any suppose that this is referable to Jesus Christ, the contrary will appear by observing that the apostle speaks of an *object shown*, and a *person who shows it*. Christ is the object exhibited. The Father who in his time will show him, is the blessed and only Potentate, &c.

One God and Father of all. Eph. iv. 6.

The only Lord God. Jude 4.

There is but one God, the Father. 1 Cor. viii. 6.

The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. xi. 31.

CHAPTER VIII.

Containing remarks on the connection of the scriptural testimony of the character of the Son of God with the other doctrines of revealed truth.

It is alleged by Trinitarians, as a confirmation of the correctness of their views, that those views only can be made to harmonize with all the important truths of the gospel. I was once of the opinion that the doctrine of Jesus Christ's supreme Deity, was essential to several important doctrines revealed in the word of God. But I always felt a difficulty in attempting to reconcile it with the *divine unity*. And I may confidently appeal to every candid reader to determine, whether the views advocated in these pages, or the views of Trinitarians best accord with the important truth "To us, there is but *ONE GOD THE FATHER*." Without reference to any particular system, let any christian candidly consider, whether he can possibly conceive of *three equal persons*, without conceiving of *three equal beings*? Can we conceive of three equal persons, each of which is God, without conceiving of three equal Gods? Or can we conceive of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as *together* constituting the only true God, without conceiving that the Father *alone* is not the one God? Far be it, that we should pry into those "*secret things*" which belong to God; but "the things which are revealed" are for us and for our children to understand. And what is more plainly revealed than the truth, that "there is but one God *THE FATHER*?"

It is indeed observed, that the word *person* is used "merely from the poverty of language," and that "we speak of *persons* in the Godhead, to express that which in some respect or other corresponds to *persons* as applied to men." It is admitted that the word "*persons* as applied to men" always signifies *distinct beings*. Can we then, have an idea of three equal divine persons, without

having an idea, which in some respect supposes three equal Gods? If we have an idea *analogous* to three equal persons, we must certainly have an idea *analogous* to three equal beings, which is to have an idea analogous to the greatest error in the world. If we use "the language of approximation," let it be that which approximates to *truth* and not to *error*. When it is said, "God is angry with the wicked," (although we know that the mind of the Deity cannot be affected with the passion of anger as we are,) no idea is conveyed to the mind which is contrary to any revealed truth, but an idea perfectly harmonious with that truth. The expression impresses the mind with an idea of God's holy opposition to sin. But the proposition, that there are three persons in the Deity, if it convey any idea at all, must certainly impress the mind with an idea opposed to the revealed truth of the divine unity.

The efficacy of "THE ATONEMENT" is supposed by many to depend on the union of the Deity with the man Christ Jesus in one person. It must be conceded, that the necessity of such a union is no where *expressly* revealed in the scriptures. The necessity of it is *inferred* by the following mode of reasoning: Sin is an *infinite* evil. Justice requires *infinite* satisfaction. No *finite* being can render it. An *adequate* mediator must therefore be an *infinite being*. It is obvious, that, according to this statement, there must be two infinite beings, or the infinite Jehovah must himself mediate between himself and fallen man, or all mankind must perish. The two first suppositions are unscriptural and absurd. The latter, the infinite love of God hath prevented. It must be admitted that sin is an infinite evil *in this sense*, that it is opposed to infinite benevolence, and in its own nature tends to produce general disorder in the universe. But it is not an infinite evil, because it is *the act of an infinite being*. Now, if sin is to be viewed as an infinite evil, though not the act of an infinite being, because of its nature and tendency; must not the atonement of the Son of God, on the very same principle, be considered as an infinite atonement, though *not the act of an infinite being*, because its nature and tendency is to honor the infinite perfections of Jehovah, and produce infinite order and blessedness in the universe?

It is also argued, "if the most exalted creature be dependent on God, for his existence and faculties, it is obvious that he is bound to love and serve him, with all these

faculties; and if, when he has served his Maker to the extent of his power, he has done no more than his duty, it is evident, that he can make no proper satisfaction for the offences of others." It must be admitted, that the Son of God, "who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature," was ever under obligation to "do always those things which please" God. But it was not his duty to humble himself, and suffer and die *on his own account*. The tenor of that law of love by which the Infinite governs all intelligences appears to be, Obey and live. Disobey and die. But the sinner's friend knew no sin himself. Justice required no tear of sorrow, no suffering of the holy and well beloved Son of God, much less that unspeakable grief, and those overwhelming agonies which he endured when "the chastisement of our peace was upon him." His humiliation, suffering, and death, were a *voluntary sacrifice* for the most glorious end, even to manifest the harmony of the perfections of God in the salvation of men. "To declare—his righteousness, that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." What a glorious view of the perfection and immutability of the holy law of God was exhibited to the powers in the heavenly places, when they heard their Lord and Maker say, "Lo, I come," &c. What a view of the love of God to man, when they saw his beloved Son expire on the cross!

And now we ask, since he who is the most glorious being in the universe, God only excepted, hath magnified and honored the law by his own *real* humiliation and obedience unto death; what has reason to allege against God having mercy "on whom he will have mercy," and pardoning every penitent, believing sinner? Who shall limit the creative power of Jehovah, (before whom the nations of the earth are as a drop of the bucket) and say, that it is impossible for him to create a being of such vast dignity and glory, whose voluntary humiliation and obedience and sufferings, shall be adequate to display his justice in pardoning the penitent sinner? How precious is the following testimony: "After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs ac-

cording to the hope of eternal life." Titus iii. 4-7. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved; in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph. i. 3-7.

It is admitted by our Trinitarian brethren, that according to their views, all the *real* obedience, and sufferings, and death of the Son of God, were *only human*. Indeed, it is absurd to suppose that the supreme Deity is capable of actual suffering. Where then, we ask, is that peculiar love of God in the gift of his Son, to suffer and die for us, of which the scriptures speak? Where that *glorious dignity* of the *real* sufferer, which the scriptural representation excites us to behold and admire? Does not the divine testimony represent that the great love of God to us was manifested by the *greatness of the gift*? "Thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift." Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he first loved us, and gave his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." "We have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God." "For God so loved the world that he gave his *only begotten Son*," &c. Does not the opinion that the term *Son of God*, signifies only human nature miraculously begotten, divest all these passages of their peculiar force and beauty? Does it not diminish the love of God in the gift of his Son in an unspeakable degree? Can any unbiased mind avoid perceiving that the scriptures of truth plainly teach us, that it was the *very same glorious character* that was with the Father before the world was, that "came down from heaven," who *really and actually* humbled himself, and suffered and died on the cross?

Another serious objection to the views of our Trinitarian brethren may now be considered. After the most diligent and prayerful examination of this important subject, it does appear to me, that the doctrine of the Trinity presents no adequate "Mediator between God and man." I am fully

aware that the impressions of Trinitarians on this subject are just the reverse. But the cause of this, I apprehend is, that they have not sufficiently considered that a *Mediator*, must be viewed in *distinction from both parties at variance*. They consider the Mediator as *the supreme God himself*, united to the man Jesus. But this is repugnant to all just ideas of mediatorship; for a mediator is one that *intervenes between other persons*. So the scriptures represent that there is "one Mediator between God and men." A person cannot *mediate or intercede* for himself. The *Mediator* between God and men, therefore, whoever he is, must be viewed as *distinct from both*. The Mediator, consequently, according to the doctrine of the Trinity is a mere man, and all his humiliation and sufferings, his death, and his intercession, can have no other virtue or merit than that of *simple holy humanity*. And can such a mediator be adequate to the important purpose of saving rebel man consistently with the holy perfections of God? Can the offering of *simple humanity*, the offering of a *single man*, be a competent "propitiation for the sins of the whole world?" Was this all the displeasure manifested against sin by infinite holiness, when darkness overshadowed the mount of Calvary, and the rending rocks proclaimed that Jesus had expired? Nay, verily, for "surely this was the Son of God." This was "the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature," "by whom also he made the worlds."

The best writers on Atonement, consider it an *essential principle*, that the sufferings and death of the Mediator, must exhibit to the universe, the *evil* nature of sin, and the perfection of the law of God, as clearly and fully, as the *execution of the penalty of the law on all transgressors* would have done. Now, can any person capable of reflection, suppose that the most acute sufferings of a single holy man, for a few years, can manifest the holiness of the law, the evil of sin, and the divine displeasure against it, *as much* as the *entire destruction of the whole human race*? It is easy, indeed, to say, that the union of Deity with humanity give virtue to his sufferings. But whatever union we imagine to exist between Deity and humanity, unless we suppose a union, by which Deity should be *really humbled* and *actually suffer*; it is obvious that *the whole suffering*, which is the *ground of atonement* is merely human; and thus it is demonstrated that there can be no more virtue or efficacy in the atonement than that of

simple humanity. It is indeed an important truth, that dignity of character, rather than quantity of suffering, gives efficacy to atonement; but it is important to remember, that it is the dignity of him who really suffers.—When the Grecian king Zaleucus, required his own son to lose one of his eyes for transgressing the law against adultery, the king manifested his inflexible regard to righteousness: but if, instead of this, he had caused the eye of a fly to be put out, and spared his son, he would have rendered his law and authority contemptible throughout his whole kingdom. So, when the holy intelligences beheld the Eternal Majesty giving his own Son, his best beloved, “the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person:”—when they saw him really and voluntarily divest himself of the glory he had with the Father before the world was;—when they saw the very same glorious Spirit actually suffering during the period of his humiliation; in the garden of Gethsemane, and on the cross when his God withdrew his consolation,—then they saw the glorious fulfilment of the prophetic word, “He will magnify the law, and make it honorable.” But if, instead of this, they had seen a mere man suffer and die, and the Word or Son of God (with whom that man was supposed to be in some mysterious manner united) not suffer at all, they must surely have had vastly lower conceptions of the glory of the law, the evil of sin, and of the determination of Jehovah to maintain his holy authority in the universe.

It is the inconceivable dignity and perfection of the real sufferer, that gives value and efficacy to the atonement.—And in the perfect obedience of the only begotten Son of God, even to the death of the cross, we behold an adequate expression of the divine displeasure against sin, and of the righteousness and immutability of that law of which it is the transgression. Thus, in our precious Redeemer, “mercy and truth meet together;” “righteousness and peace embrace each other.”

Who then, may I be permitted to ask, has the most scriptural and exalted views of the “one Mediator between God and men?” He who views the real sufferings and death of the Lamb of God, as merely human; or he who views these as the great sacrifice of that only begotten Son of God who was with him before the world was, and is the brightness of his glory and express image of his person? Can any reflecting mind fail of perceiving that the real atonement in the latter case must reflect far more honor on

the justice of God in pardoning sinners for the sake of his dear Son, than in the former?

Among all the various objects in the universe the mind is capable of contemplating, there is none on which the renewed soul loves to fasten with such intensity, as on the Cross. At Calvary she delights to linger, to admire the concentration of the glory of God in his expiring Son. On this astonishing spectacle, indeed, do all holy beings fix their minds with the most solicitous desire and ardent praise, from the exalted seraph, who burns with increasing rapture, to the babe in Christ, out of whose mouth God hath perfected his praise. And such is the increasing delight my soul hath enjoyed in the contemplation of this subject, since the Lord has favored me with a more correct knowledge of his only begotten and well beloved Son, that I feel it to be an ample remuneration for all that deeply regretted loss of fellowship, the manifestation of these views will occasion. My heart's desire and prayer to God for my brethren is, that they may behold this glory: that they may see the vast difference between the real and actual humiliation, and sufferings and death of the Son of God who made the worlds, and the sufferings and death of simple humanity: and that they may perceive how totally inadequate the latter must be to answer the purpose of divine wisdom in manifesting the righteousness of God in the salvation of millions of men; and how completely the former exhibits to us that God can “be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.”

It has been also considered, that the doctrine of the total moral depravity of man, is connected with Trinitarian views of the Savior. If the above remarks on the scriptural doctrine of atonement are correct, it is evident that no such connection exists. Indeed, it is obvious, that the Trinitarian sentiment is far more difficult to reconcile with the doctrine of man's entire guilt, pollution, and ruin, than the sentiments advocated in these pages: because the former exhibits a far inferior sacrifice for sin than the latter. In the former case we behold the real sufferer on the cross as man only; in the latter, we view him as the matchless Son of God united to the body prepared for him. It may be said that those who disbelieve the doctrine of the Trinity, generally deny the scriptural doctrines of total depravity, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, personal election according to the sovereign pleasure of God, who will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, the perseverance of

the saints in holiness, &c. Suppose it is so. Is it not a fact also, that many *Trinitarians* deny these doctrines? Are not some Arminians, and others Universalists? If the character of the doctrine of the Trinity is to be determined by the character of those who have avowed it, what shall we think of it, when we find the Beast himself, the Pope of Rome, and thousands who bear his image, among its most zealous advocates? May we not as well argue that the doctrine cannot be true, because it was connected with all the false doctrine and superstitions of the most anti-christian community that ever existed, as to argue that the opposite doctrine cannot be true, because many, or most of its advocates are in some important points erroneous? The most erroneous may be convinced of some truth. Satan himself acknowledged Jesus to be the "holy one of God." Are we to deny it, because he confessed it? I cannot speak concerning others; but I know that, notwithstanding I have had doubts of the truth of the Trinitarian sentiment for many years, these doubts have produced no change of mind respecting the doctrines of God's holy sovereignty in personal election, total depravity, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, justification by grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus, the perseverance of all saints, and the "everlasting destruction" of those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. And since my mind has been established in my present views, by a diligent and prayerful examination of the divine testimony; I have experienced a precious enlargement of soul in the contemplation of the love of God in the gift of his Son, and in the view of the efficacy of the atonement, and the honor done thereby to all the holy perfections of Jehovah in the salvation of lost man. Many passages of divine truth, which were before unintelligible to me, now appear clear, and beautifully harmonizing with the general truth of the gospel.

Without being justly chargeable with want of candor or charity, we have certainly scriptural reason to believe that the views which many cherish and avow concerning the Son of God, are such as tend to "frustrate the grace of God," and entirely pervert the gospel of Christ. With such as substitute human virtue in the place of the great sacrifice, and refuse to unite with the heavenly host in worshipping the Lamb, my mind can never harmonize. Let us pray for such that they may behold "the glory of God as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ," and no longer

reject his counsel against themselves; solemnly considering that it is impossible to escape the wrath of Almighty God, "if we neglect so great salvation."

CHAPTER IX.

Containing strictures on some late publications.

The following remarks are not communicated for the sake of exposing the inconsistencies of my respected christian brethren; but with the desire, that (by convincing each other of the impropriety of any of our present views,) we may be more united in the holy truth.

In Mr. Miller's third Letter on Unitarianism, he asks, "Where, then, is the absurdity or contradiction of an *eternal necessary emanation* from him, (God the Father) or, if you please, an *eternal generation*?" To this Mr. Stuart in his Letters to Mr. Miller, (p. 78,) replies; "The scriptures then, as you aver, have left the three fold mode of existence *unexplained*. May I be permitted to ask, now, if teaching the doctrine of the *eternal and necessary emanation or generation* of the Son of God, (whom as *Son* you view to be the second person in the Trinity,) be not attempting an explanation of a subject, which the sacred writers leave *unexplained*? Is not existence or subsistence by *emanation*, a *mode* of existence?"

I would now respectfully ask Mr. Stuart, if teaching the doctrine of *three persons in one God*, "be not attempting an explanation of a subject which the sacred writers leave *unexplained*?" Is not existence by plurality of persons a *mode* of existence? Are not the words *three persons in the Godhead*, an attempted definition of that very distinction in the Deity which you acknowledge to be "*undefinable*?"

Mr. Miller also remarks, "That mystery should be readily allowed to exist every where in God's *creation*, and in God's *providence*, and at the same time be unceremoniously rejected from God's *revelation*, is more than strange!" To this, Mr. Stuart, (p. 88.) replies in the following excellent manner: "The cry of *mystery, mystery*, which is so often raised against certain doctrines of the scriptures, can never influence the real lover of truth to reject them. But what is unintelligible, or surpasses our comprehension, belongs to *things* and not to *words*,"

* This is an important distinction. The "words" used by the inspired writers to convey divine truth to the mind are *intelligible* words. If not

What we *express* respecting things, must of course be intelligible; for language is merely the vehicle by which our thoughts are conveyed to others. What we understand in our own minds, we can express to the mind of others; and what we do not understand, of course we cannot express, because our language, which is only the vehicle by which our thoughts are conveyed, cannot convey thoughts or conceptions which do not exist. It is very easy then, to draw the line of distinction, between mystery which is connected with *things* or phenomena, and mystery which belongs only to *language*. The latter, I take it, always proceeds either from want of skill, or crafty design, or an intention to speak enigmas. We are not allowed, therefore, by the common laws of language, to assert any thing which, when examined, proves to be either a contradiction, or an incongruity; and then to take refuge from objections which may be made to our language, under the pretence that the subject is mysterious, and consequently, it is improper to urge investigation respecting it. It may be true, indeed, that the subject of which we speak is mysterious. But what I have expressed about such a subject, if I have used language with any propriety, is, of course, only what I knew or conceived about it in my own mind. This can certainly be made intelligible to another mind; and there is, therefore, no mystery in my *expression*; at least there ought to be none."

After this just and lucid distinction between *words unintelligible* and *things undefinable*, if I ask Mr. S. what

they could not reveal that truth to the mind. The words, "There is one God, the Father" are *intelligible* words. The words, "there are three persons in one God," in the position they occupy in the proposition, are *unintelligible*. The revelation of an incomprehensibility is a contradiction, for that which cannot be *understood* by the human mind cannot be *revealed* to the human mind. There are many secret things belonging to God and incomprehensible to us *which are connected* with things revealed and comprehensible; but the things which are revealed belong to us to know, to believe and to practise, and therefore must all be comprehensible. To suppose otherwise is to suppose that the divine purpose in revelation is frustrated.

In our English version we read indeed of "the revelation of the mystery," &c. "Great is the mystery of godliness," &c. The true meaning of Paul is the revelation of the *secret*, for such is the import of the Greek term. (See G. Campbell's dissertations.) The glorious truths of the Gospel and the gracious purpose of God that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs with the Jews, were secrets, "now made manifest." Rom. xvi. 25, 26. There are indeed many things *connected* with revealed godliness which are incomprehensible; but this is not the meaning of the apostle in 1. Tim. iii. 16. as is commonly supposed. The mystery or secret is revealed in the passage itself in six comprehensible facts.

is that distinction of which he speaks, when he says, there are three persons in the Godhead; can he consistently answer, "I do not know?" Mr. S. indeed says, "we speak of *person* in the Godhead, to express that which in some respect or other corresponds to *persons*, as applied to men, i. e. some *distinction*." I reply, the term as applied to men signifies *distinct beings*; does he use it in this sense? Mr. S. will answer, certainly not. I ask Mr. S. then, (for his own principles authorize me to pursue the enquiry,) In what sense, as the term is applied to men, do you use it in application to the Deity? I wish to know what ideas any person has in his mind corresponding with *his declaration*, that there are three persons in one God; a declaration no where to be found in the scriptures. It is true, "the subject of which we speak is mysterious. But what I have *expressed* about such a subject, if I have used language with any propriety, is, of course, only what I knew or conceived about it in my own mind. This can certainly be made intelligible to another mind; and there is, therefore, no mystery in my *expression*; at least there ought to be none."

If the scriptures reveal any distinction in "the only true God," let it be stated in "the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth." But to use expressions on this important subject, of which we have no corresponding ideas in our own minds, is certainly to "darken counsel with words without knowledge." Mr. S. himself says, (p. 34.) Letters to Mr. C. "I could heartily wish, indeed, that the word *person* never had come into the symbols of the churches." Yet he says, "it is perhaps inexpedient or even impossible altogether to reject it." So long, indeed, as we prefer the words which *man's wisdom teacheth*, to those which the *Holy Ghost teacheth*, it will probably be retained. I would however respectfully request my dear brother S. if he continues to use it, to inform us whether the mystery of the *language* proceeds "from want of skill, or an intention to speak enigmas?" Of "crafty design" I would not suspect him a moment.

Mr. Stuart remarks to Mr. Miller, on the subject of eternal generation, (p. 81.) "To understand how the *same numerical essence* can be said to *communicate the whole* of itself to the *same numerical essence*, I must give over in despair, to intellects of a different order from that which I possess." But I ask, is this any more unintelligible than

Mr. Stuart's definition of John i. 1. which supposes that *the same numerical essence was with the same numerical essence?* Page 36, Letters to Mr. C., Mr. S. refers the terms "*sending and being sent*," to the first and second persons in the Godhead. Accordingly, he represents that *the same numerical essence SENT and WAS SENT BY the same numerical essence!* Is this any more intelligible? Or, can any proposition be more unintelligible than the following? *The same numerical essence, PRAYED to the same numerical essence to be glorified with the glory which he had with the same numerical essence before the world was.* To any one who possesses intellect capable of understanding this, I should think the sentiment of Mr. Miller can present no difficulty.

Mr. Stuart, says (p. 92,) "*The Logos is really and verily divine, self-existent, uncaused, immutable in himself.*" Mr. Miller, (p. 107) remarks, "*If this be true of the Logos, it is also true of the other persons. But if this be so, are there not three Gods?*" To avoid this difficulty, Mr. M. who is also a zealous Trinitarian, denies that either of the persons possesses complete divinity. The inspired apostle indeed assures us that "*there is but one God THE FATHER.*" Mr. M.'s system obviously denies this divine testimony. His words are, "*as I understand this subject the three persons of the blessed Trinity TOGETHER constitute one self-existent, independent and infinitely perfect God.*" Again he says, "*We cannot say that each person possesses in himself complete separate and independent divinity.*"* *It appears, then, that all the censure that Mr. M. has passed on those who deny the complete and independent divinity of the Son of God, falls upon himself.* If Mr. M. supposes, that according to Mr. S.'s views, there are three Gods; may not Mr. S. infer from Mr. M.'s system that there is no God at all?

Does not the system of that writer clearly represent the ONE GOD as *divisible*? When he conceives of the FATHER, *in distinction from the Son and HOLY SPIRIT*, must he not conceive of him, (I ask with reverence and regret) as *one-third* of the infinite Deity? How revolting to the intelligent mind is such a theory! Mr. M. also supposes that the divine persons in the Godhead are distinguished from each other "*by an incommunicable property.*" (p. 36.) If so, it necessarily follows, that the distinguish-

*Letters to Stuart, p. 106, 107. Will Mr. M. inform us by what process of reasoning he proves that three, or any number of imperfect persons can make one perfect God?

ing properties or perfections of the second and third persons are not possessed by the first; consequently, the Father is not *infinitely perfect*.

I rejoice that I am able to close these strictures with a quotation from Mr. Stuart, which manifests the triumphant victory of his good sense, at one happy moment, over an erroneous system. He assures Mr. Channing, (p. 114,) that it "*is incorrect,—to represent them (Trinitarians) as holding that Jesus Christ is the same being as the Father if you mean by this, in all respects the same.*" Certainly this is synonymous with saying, that HE IS *in some respect* ANOTHER AND DISTINCT BEING. Let this concession, then, suffice to terminate the controversy with Mr. S. concerning the doctrine of the Trinity.

Note. Mr. Bedell, in a sermon on the Trinity, remarks, "*The fatal error which infidels and other sceptics make on this subject is this: They apply to a fact, that which is true only of a mode of existence.*" What is the supposed fact? It is that there are three persons in one God. Now I ask, does not this proposition itself declare "*a mode of existence?*" The venerated author attempts to illustrate the subject by exhibiting the distinction between the fact that *the grass grows*, and the manner *how it grows*. He asks, "*now because I believe nothing about the manner in which it grows, do I not therefore believe that it grows?*" Unquestionably I see that it grows, I understand that it grows, I believe that it grows, and no man on the face of the earth can say more, or is required to say more.

Now, if any man on the face of the earth can truly say, "*I understand that*" three persons are one God, he must acknowledge the aptitude of this illustration. If the proposition that there are three persons in one God is as intelligible as the proposition, "*the grass grows,*" then has our author fairly untied this Gordian knot. Is it so? Can any man have an idea of one, two or three persons, without having an idea of one, two or three beings? The proposition, "*the grass grows,*" is perfectly intelligible, although we know not *how it grows*. It contradicts no known truth or fact, whereas, the proposition that there are three persons in one God is *in itself* unintelligible and contradictory. It contradicts the known fact that every distinct intelligent person is a distinct intelligent being.

CHAPTER X.

Containing concluding remarks.

It is truly lamentable that so many professed christians are contented to believe what they have been taught from their earliest days, and what their pious ancestors believed, without diligently searching the scriptures to know the truth. I do not make this observation with particular reference to any one denomination of christians. Alas! it is too applicable to us all. It is a solemn consideration, that if we embrace any sentiment, true or false, merely because we have been taught it "*by man,*" our

faith cannot be acceptable to God; for it stands in the wisdom of men, and not in the power of God. It is indeed an affecting thought, that the faith of many respecting the most interesting subjects, "is taught by the precept of men." Let us imitate the noble Bereans who "searched the scriptures daily," to ascertain whether what Paul preached was according to the word of God. As the disciples of Jesus are to be sanctified "through the truth," how can their holy union be effected, without a diligent and prayerful study of the word of the Lord, independently of all the systems of men? It is to the "more sure word of prophecy," and to "the testimony of Jesus," which is its spirit or substance, that we do well to take heed, "as unto a light that shineth in a dark place."

The opposition which many pious persons feel to several revealed truths, arises from a misconception of those truths, and from the consequent false inferences which flow from that misconception. Thus many object to the doctrines of election, and the immutability of the divine purposes. And thus many object to the scriptural character of the Son of God. It is necessary to suspend our judgment until we have diligently compared *the whole of the divine testimony*, on any particular subject, and not hastily adopt an opinion on the examination of a few detached passages, and thus sacrifice the truth to our own slothfulness or popularity. Is it worthy a rational man to cry out heresy against any sentiment, when he has not even once taken his Bible and compared *all the passages* which relate to that sentiment? Yet how often is this done by professed christians!

As many persons appear to be confirmed in the belief of the doctrine of the Trinity, and are deterred from a diligent examination of the subject, by the supposition that almost all pious christians in every age have believed it, it is desirable that such a mistake should be corrected. The following quotations will serve to show that many of the primitive christians did not believe that the Son of God was either *self-existent* or *eternal*.

Irenæus, who was but second from John, says, "John, declaring the one God Almighty, and the *only begotten* Christ Jesus by whom all things were made, &c.* He exhibited a creed which embraced the *general belief of christians in that age*. He says, "the church, which is

* Historical Views of Heresies, page 53.

dispersed through the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles, and their immediate successors, the belief in one God, THE FATHER ALMIGHTY, the maker of the heaven, the earth, and the sea,* and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, made flesh for our salvation, &c. That to Christ Jesus our Lord, and God and Savior and King, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, every knee shall bow," &c.†

How evident is it from this creed, that "the general belief of christians" in the primitive ages, agreed with that of the apostle Paul, "to us there is but one God, THE FATHER." How evident it is that they believed that the Son was *begotten*, and that all his dignity and exaltation was "according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father."

Ignatius, who lived in the first century, says, "If any one say there is one God, and doth not confess Jesus Christ, but thinks the Lord to be a mere man, and not the *only begotten* God, the wisdom and word, &c., he is a serpent," &c.‡ "In the shepherd of Hermas, a writer contemporary with Clemens Romanus," is the following passage: "God," says he, placed that Holy Spirit, *which was created first of all*, in the body in which he might dwell," &c.§ Justin Martyr, who lived about the middle of the second century, says, "God in the beginning, before any thing was created, *begat a Rational Power, from himself*; which is called by the Holy Ghost, Glory of the Lord, and sometimes Son, Wisdom, Angel, God, Lord,

* A learned author remarks respecting John i. 3, 10, Col. i. 16; "The preposition DIA, in these passages translated BY, does not signify by any one as an original cause, (for this sense is expressed by a different preposition, HYPO,) but it denotes THROUGH ANY THING AS AN INSTRUMENT." "Eusebius—the learned, accurate, and laborious author—who could not possibly be mistaken about the common meaning of two prepositions, which he used daily and hourly in conversation and in books, explaining the commencement of John's gospel, uses these words: "And when he says, in one place, (ver. 10.) that the world, and in another (ver. 3) that all things, were made through him, he declares the ministration of the Word to God. For, when the Evangelist might have said, "All things were made by him;" and again, "The world was made by him;" he has not said (HYPO) "By him," but (DIA) "Through him;" in order that he might raise our conceptions to the undervalued power of the Father as the original cause of all things." Lastly, the same distinction is noticed by Philo, the Jew, who was contemporary with our Savior, who wrote in Greek, and in several parts of his writings expresses the difference between a supreme and a subordinate creator by the opposed use of these two prepositions. See Wetstein's Note on John i. 3." If this criticism were not correct, it would still be true that God created all things by Jesus Christ. Eph. iii. 9; Heb. i. 2.

† Historical Views of Heresies, p. 76.

‡ Stuart's Letters to Miller, p. 19.

* Eusebius Eccles. Theol. Lib. 1. c. 20.

§ Ibid. p. 69.

Logos. All the above names he bears, because he *ministers to the will of the Father, and was begotten by the will of the Father.** Clemens Alexandrinus says, "There is one unbegotten being, the Almighty God. And there is one begotten before all things, by whom all things were made." He also calls the Logos "*the first created wisdom,*" and he "who approximates the nearest to the only Almighty." "The older by birth," &c.†

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, a little after the middle of the second century, says, "The Son of God is *created and made*—and as he is a created being, he existed not before he was made." Again: "God was not always Father; the Son was not always; but the supreme God was once without the Logos, and the Son was not, before he was begotten; for he is not eternal, but came into being afterwards."‡ Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch at the close of the third century, asserts that he was begotten before all ages, (or worlds,) and that he was "the first born of every creature."§ Methodius, bishop of Tyre about the end of the third century, calls the Logos "the first begotten of God."|| Novatian says, "God the Father—creator—un-originated, invisible, immense, immortal, eternal, the only God—from whom, *when he pleased*, the Word his Son was born."¶

Is it possible for language to express more fully, that these primitive christians did not believe that the one Almighty God consists of a trinity of persons? Is it possible for words to declare more explicitly, that the Word or Son, is, in his highest nature, a distinct being from the Father, and dependent on him for all things? "The first born of every creature," and most glorious of all dependent intelligences.

The piety of Mr. Isaac Watts, "whose praise is in the churches," will not be doubted. Few persons have studied the important and interesting subject discussed in these pages with the humility, diligence and prayer which he did. In his researches after truth, he clearly perceived that the word of God teaches that our dear Savior existed in a glorious state, but *inferior to the Father, before he "was made flesh."* To reconcile this truth with the supreme deity of Jesus Christ, he adopted the theory of the pre-existence of Christ's human soul. On farther examination, it appears he was convinced that the doctrine of Christ's supreme deity is unscriptural; for in his last

* Stuart's Letters to Miller, p. 23. † Ibid. 44, 45. ‡ Ibid. 53.
§ Ibid. 54. || Ibid. 55. ¶ Ibid. 58.

letter to Mr. Colman of Boston, dated Feb. 11, 1747, he says, "I think I have said every thing concerning the Son of God; which scripture says; but I could not go so far as to say with some of our orthodox divines, that the Son is *equal* with the Father; because our Lord himself expressly says, "My Father is *greater* than I."* About the same period, some pious christians in England believed what was called the "*indwelling scheme*;" which is, that the Son is supreme Deity *by the union or indwelling of the Father*, who is the only true God, with the man Christ Jesus: and that there are no distinct persons in the Godhead. This scheme implies that the Word or Son had no existence whatever, distinct from the Father, before he appeared on earth, and is, consequently, opposed to innumerable passages of scripture.

Few men have been more justly esteemed for correct views, and perspicuous illustration of divine truth, than Andrew Fuller. In mature age, he wrote a very convincing essay on the *Sonship of Christ*: in which, I think, he clearly proves, that the terms SON OF GOD, ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, are expressive of the highest nature, and most glorious character of the "WORD." He indeed considered these terms as importing supreme Deity and perfect equality, ONE THING EXCEPTED. This will unavoidably follow from his views. He says, "*in the order of nature, the Father must have existed before the Son.*"† Here, then, is a striking proof that it is impossible for the greatest minds to avoid falling into inconsistency, when they embrace error. If, as Mr. Fuller says, "the Father and the Son are *properly eternal*:" we may as well say, that in the order of nature, the Son must have existed before the Father, as to say, that the Father must have existed before the Son. Nothing could have existed *in any sense, before* that which is *properly eternal*, because that which is properly eternal can have no beginning. Besides, if the Son is eternal as the Father, there must be TWO ETERNAL SPIRITS, which is contrary to scripture and reason.

Mr. Stuart, whose talents command our respect, and whose piety and candor excite our affection and esteem, has furnished us with a similar example. After all he has written, he is obliged to acknowledge that the Son, in respect to his highest nature, is not "*in all respects, the same being as the Father.*" He must, consequently,

*Memoirs of Watts and Doddridge, Boston edit. 1793, p. 29.

† Fuller's Essays, p. 134.

in one respect at least, be a distinct being from the Father ; and as certainly *dependent* upon him, as that there cannot be two distinct independent beings. I apprehend that one principal cause why many pious persons do not perceive the revealed truth on this subject is, an impression that the more firmly they believe, and the more positively they affirm, that Jesus Christ is the supreme Deity, the more they manifest their love to him. Let our Lord's answer to Peter, when he said, "Be it far from thee," be seriously and candidly considered. Peter undoubtedly felt a sincere regard for his Savior, and was *influenced by this very regard*; to wish that he might escape from those sufferings he spake of. But as Peter's zeal was "*not according to knowledge*," and his affectionate feelings were expressed in a manner *inconsistent with truth*, he received the severe rebuke of his Master. Now, I solemnly ask, if we follow the example of Peter, and affirm any thing of Jesus Christ which is *contrary to truth*; is not the answer of our Lord, as applicable, in some degree, to us, as it was to him? If, to the declaration of the Son of God, "My Father is greater than I," we reply, "Be it far from thee, Lord;" must not our erroneous zeal be, "an offence" to the holy mind of him who assures us, "*I honor my Father,—I seek not my own glory*?" And if the sincerity and affection of the apostle, (which surely was not less than ours,) did not screen him from the severe rebuke of our Lord, can we expect to escape his censure?

In concluding, let us review a few of the passages discussed in the preceding pages, and contrast them with Trinitarian sentiments. I am sensible that *error* as well as *truth* may receive *apparent* support by this method; but this is only when the most obvious and literal import of a passage is not according to the general analogy of the scriptures. Whether that is the case or not with the following, the candid reader will judge.

JESUS CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES.

To us there is but one God, the Father. 1 Cor. viii. 6.

My Father is greater than I. John xiv. 28.

Who is the *image* of the invisible God, the first born of every creature. Col. i. 15.

The Son can do nothing of himself. John v. 19.

TRINITARIANS.

To us, there is but one God, the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost.

The Son is as great as the Father.

Who is the invisible God, the uncreated Jehovah.

The Son is omnipotent.

JESUS CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES.

But of that day, &c. knoweth no man, no not the angels, &c. *neither the Son, but the Father.* Mark xiii. 32.

All power is *given* unto me in heaven and in earth. Matthew xxviii. 18.

As thou hast *given* him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. John xvii. 2.

God, who created all things by Jesus Christ. Eph. iii. 9.

By whom also he made the worlds. Heb. i. 2.

The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him. Rev. i. 1.

For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. 1 Timothy ii. 5.

Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. Jude 4.

Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and signs, and wonders which God did by him. Acts ii. 22.

For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he *given* to the Son to have life in himself. John v. 26.

I live by the Father. John vi. 57.

This is my beloved Son. Matt. iii. 17.

That they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. John xvii. 3.

That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow—and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Phil. ii. 11.

TRINITARIANS.

The Son is omniscient, and knew of that day as well as the Father.

No *given* power can qualify the Son of God to give eternal life to his people.

Jesus Christ created all things by his own independent power.

The Revelation of Jesus Christ from his own omniscience.

There is one Mediator between God and man; who is also supreme God and man in one person.

Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, who is also the only Lord God, and a distinct person.

Jesus performed his miracles by his own omnipotence.

The son is self-existent.

The son lives by himself.

This is the only true God, the same numerical essence as the Father.

That they might know thee, who art not the only true God, in distinction from the Word whom thou hast sent.

That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow—and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to his own glory.

The fact that our divine Redeemer is *called by some* of the names of the Father, is considered by many as evidence that he is that VERY BEING whose SON he is declared to be. They appear to have forgotten, that it was a common Hebrew custom to give significant names both to persons and places. Jesus Christ was called by the name of DAVID. Was he therefore the identical son of

n,"
l of

he
ath

t, it
ree
ex-
be
ath-

and
in
tain
him
with
thor

nsti-
24,
ject
on of

ap-
d of
After
—of
"he
bath
stion
no in
ensa-
rary
ness"
mand
har-
t the
n and
how-
lduce

Jesse? John the Baptist was called Elijah. Mal. iv. 5. Was he therefore *the very same being*? If it was proper that the forerunner of our Lord should be called by this name, (which signifies God the Lord) because he came, "in the spirit and power of Elias," surely, it was proper that our blessed Lord himself should be *called* by some of the names of the invisible Father, in whose spirit and power he came down from heaven, and of whom he is *by nature* "the express image."

Some presume to derive an argument for the Supreme Deity of the Son, from the fact of his being associated with the Father as an object of worship, and from the fact of his being associated with him in the baptismal formula. The inconclusiveness of such reasoning is manifest from the facts that the king of Israel, 1 Chron. xxix, 20, is associated with Jehovah as an object of worship, and that the Israelites were baptised into (eis) Moses. 1 Cor. x, 2. See also, Ex. xiv. 31, 1 Sam. xii. 18.

To show the puerility of the argument of Mr. Jones, Mr. Wardlaw and others, derived from the plural word Elohim, it is only necessary to quote the following from Wilson's Hebrew grammar, p. 270. "Words that express dominion, dignity, majesty, are commonly put in the plural." See Ex. xxi, 4. Is. xix, 4. Mal. i. 6. Bush observes "the use of the plural in such cases seems to be merely for the purpose of giving to the word greater fullness," &c. If it were not so, how could it prove a plurality of *persons* and not a plurality of *Gods* when the term itself is *Gods*? "The plural term *Gods*, Elohim, is used of one of the persons alone. *Thy throne, O Gods, is forever and ever. And, O Gods, thy Gods have anointed thee.*—Now unless Christ, the *Son*, have another Trinity in him, the plural word cannot intend three persons, but one; only it is more majestic."

1. Tim. iii. 16. The original, according to Griesbach, is *who, or which*, was manifested in the flesh, &c.*

Some have affirmed that the design of John in writing his Gospel was to establish the doctrine of the supreme deity of Jesus Christ. Let us hear the apostle himself.

* Micah. 5. 2. I am informed, by a learned Trinitarian, that "the words translated 'come forth' and 'goings forth' are of the same derivation, forms of the same verb. The term is used in the sense of *origin or descent*." Consequently, the idea that Christ is unoriginated or self-existent is excluded by this term, which accords with the plain scriptural truth that he is *begotten* of the Father. The term "everlasting" must be understood, as in many other passages, in a limited sense, for that which is strictly from eternity could have no "*origin or descent*."

Of all the things "written in this book," he says, "But these are written, that ye might believe *that Jesus is the Christ, THE SON OF GOD*, and that believing ye might have life through his name." John xx. 30, 31.

1 John v. 20. is considered by Mr. Wardlaw, as proof of the Supreme Deity of the Son of God, because "Jesus Christ" is the *immediate* antecedent to the words, "This is the true God." He acknowledges, however, that the immediate antecedent is not *always* the proper one; and notices as proof, Acts iv. 10, 11, where the immediate antecedent to the words, "This is the stone," is the healed man, who certainly was not the stone spoken of. If the word God is read in the passage, as the sense requires, and as Macknight translates it, it will be as follows: And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is the true God; and we are in the true God, *even* in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. It must be conceded that the words in our translation, "him that is true," do, in both cases, refer to the Father. Is it not then, most agreeable to the connection, to consider the words, "This is the true God," as referring to the same? And does not the declaration of Christ himself, that the Father is "the only true God," John xvii. 3, require this construction?

If the words, "This is the true God," refer to Jesus Christ, then the passage manifestly teaches the absurdity that the true God has a father, from whom he has derived his existence, for it declares that Jesus Christ is the Son of him that is true. Compare 2d Ep. of John, verse 7. To an unbiased mind, I think that it would appear equally plain that the words "him that is true" are the *proper* antecedent to the words, "this is the true God," as that the word "deceivers" is the *proper* antecedent to the words, "this is a deceiver and an antichrist," although Jesus Christ is the *immediate* antecedent in both cases.

He that *spared not his own Son*, but *delivered him up* for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Rom. viii. 32. How forcible is the argument! how consolatory the truth, which the inspired apostle addresses to his holy brethren in this passage, if we understand it agreeable to the views I advocate! It is presumed that none will deny that the terms "*spared not*," "*delivered him up*," signify *real suffering*. But what does the apostle mean, if *humanity only* suffered? How does it follow that God will give us *ALL THINGS*, because

he has given a *single man* to suffer for us? What proportionate value does a *single holy man* bear to the ALL THINGS, which an infinite God is capable of imparting? Such a sentiment entirely invalidates the apostle's argument, and deprives the church of the most precious proof of God's everlasting love! Surely, the apostle must have had very different conceptions of the dying Savior, when he exclaimed, "Thanks be to God for HIS UNSPEAKABLE GIFT!" O my brethren, had we seen the affecting spectacle on Mount Calvary! had we witnessed nature's convulsions, the heavens gathering blackness, the rocks rending, and the veil of the holy temple rent in twain! should we not have been convinced with the astonished centurion, that something more than *humanity* had expired?

I object, then, to the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead: First, Because *it is not revealed in the scriptures of truth*. There is not a single passage in the whole volume of divine revelation that declares either expressly or implicitly, that there are three persons in one God. There is not a single passage which reveals that the one God consists of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

I object to the doctrine, Secondly, Because it is not only not revealed, but *the contrary is most plainly declared in the divine testimony*. We are therein assured, not only that there is but one God, but that this one God is THE FATHER. The FATHER, as "*the only true God*," is as plainly distinguished from the Son as from all other beings.

I object to the doctrine, Thirdly, Because I find the divine testimony of the Father, the Son, the prophets and the apostles, *unitedly declaring the inferiority of the Son in his highest nature and character*.

I object to the doctrine, Fourthly, Because, *it is not simply above reason, but CONTRARY to every rational faculty, I possess*. It is impossible for me to conceive of three persons, in any sense, without conceiving of three beings. It is impossible for me to think of one glorious Spirit on the throne of the universe, and of one glorious Spirit at the right hand of him who sitteth on the throne, without thinking of two distinct glorious Spirits.

I object to the doctrine, Fifthly, Because, *it presents no adequate mediator BETWEEN God and man*. All those sufferings which constitute the ground of atonement, are according to this doctrine MERELY HUMAN.

I object to this doctrine, Finally, Because, *it excludes*

from the universe the most glorious of all beings, God only excepted. If we should admit that the immutable Jehovah, at a certain period added to his being human nature, which is to be united with him "in one person for ever;" after all that can be said, we can have no idea of the SON of God in distinction from the Father: certainly none, except that of a mere perfect man. Thus the most mighty and glorious of Jehovah's works; "the image of the invisible God;" "the first-born of every creature;" the well beloved and only begotten of the Father, the joy of earth, and the glory of heaven, is blotted out of existence. And for this mighty loss, what is substituted? NOTHING. For, beyond all controversy, there can be but ONE supreme God. "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." I cast my anxious eye around the universe, and most solicitously enquire, where is he who is "the beginning of the creation of God;" "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person?" Where is "the Word of God," who "was with God," and enjoyed glory with him "before the world was?" And where is he to whom every knee is commanded to bow, and whom the thousands of thousands of the heavenly hosts do actually worship in distinction from him that sitteth on the throne? Rev. v. 13. To this interesting enquiry, the system I am opposing gives me no satisfactory answer. In that system, the SON OF RIGHTEOUSNESS, by which the INFINITE generates, illumines and blesses the whole intelligent universe, has no place. I reject it, therefore, because, in addition to other insuperable objections, it involves a loss of being in the universe, more to be dreaded than the loss of all other created intelligences.

In closing this imperfect essay, I can sincerely adopt the language of Mr. Stuart, though with an important difference of views. "*With all this subject fully before me, I do not hesitate; I cannot doubt respecting it.*" A flood of evidence has flowed into my mind from the sacred pages, which is irresistible and overwhelming. I have a humble confidence that what I have written is conformable to "the first principles of the oracles of God." In view of the whole of the divine testimony, I am constrained to say, with the inspired apostle, "*There is but one God, THE FATHER.*" Such, however, are my views of my divine Savior, that "when my departing spirit shall quit these mortal scenes, and wing its way to the world un-

—
n,"
I of

he
ath

t, it
are
ex-
be
ath-

and
in
tain
him
with
thor

nsti-
24,
bject
on of

ap-
d of
After
—of
"he
bath
stion
no in
ensa-
rary
ness"
mand
har-
t the
n and
how-
lduce

known; with my latest breath I desire to pray, as the expiring martyr did, 'LORD JESUS, RECEIVE MY SPIRIT.'

I feel in some measure the awful responsibility I am under, while offering these pages to the public. It is indeed a small thing to be judged of man's judgment. It is comparatively, of little importance to receive the commendation or displeasure of "a man that shall die." But it is a solemn and important truth, that, for what I have written I am accountable to Him who holds the eternal destinies of all his intelligent creatures in his hands, and who "will bring every work into judgment, whether it be good or whether it be evil." If, while I have sincerely desired to know the truth, I have erred, I pray for forgiveness, for the sake of that precious Savior, who, I hope, hath loved me and given himself for me. Could I imagine that what I have written is displeasing in his holy sight, the commendation of the whole world, could not in the least degree, alleviate the grief such an apprehension would occasion. I think I can on mature reflection say, death would be preferable to publishing erroneous doctrine concerning my Lord. If any person will prove from "the word of the Lord," that I have misunderstood the divine testimony, on this important and highly interesting subject; I hope, by the grace of God, that I shall cheerfully retract what I have written.

And now, dear reader, permit me for the truth's sake, to entreat you to examine *seriously, diligently, impartially* and *prayerfully*, the word of eternal truth. Beware lest you reject the counsel of God. God forbid that any should trifle with this subject, and make it the theme of mere speculation. It is lamentable indeed to observe the little interest many precious souls feel respecting truths of infinite importance. The attention of many to these truths, alas! is nothing more than what is excited by a vain curiosity and carnal speculation. May divine grace save us from this condemnation. Let us solemnly remember that the glorious Savior whose character is imperfectly delineated in these pages, will soon appear in the clouds of heaven; we shall soon behold him coming in all his glorious majesty to judge us. Oh, may we now so believe in him, love and obey him, that we may THEN lift up our heads with joy, knowing that our redemption draweth nigh.

"Unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the ONLY wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen."

THE

ATONEMENT.

Son of God p. 50

BY

HENRY GREW.

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED BY MERRIHEW AND THOMPSON,

No. 7 Carter's Alley.

1847.

PREFACE.

That the salvation of "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God" is accomplished "*through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus*," is the common faith of the favored heirs of this salvation. That much error has obtained among them in respect to various particulars pertaining to this salvation, which mars the character of the church of the living God as "*the ground and pillar of the truth*," is manifest in their diverse views of the personal nature and of the atoning sacrifice of the great Redeemer.

Beloved christian brethren, have we not been corrupted from the simplicity of Jesus Christ by the doctrines and commandments of men? Shall we not bring our various opinions to that standard which abideth forever, and solemnly examine whether our faith is standing "in the power of God" or "in the wisdom of men?"

Is it not time to leave Calvin and Arminius, Arius and Socinus, Fox and Hicks for Jesus Christ? Is it not time to stop shackling and corrupting the minds of the disciples of the Lord by requiring assent to the creeds of fallible men, and by casting them into the sectarian molds of theological seminaries?

Holy Father! Hear and answer the prayer of thy Son. "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth—that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." John 17: 17—21

ATONEMENT.

ATONEMENT. AT-ONE-MENT. RECONCILIATION. "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions" of sin and folly. "ALL have sinned and come short of the glory of God." By his own voluntary unreasonable transgression of righteous law, perfectly adapted to his own well being, man has become unreconciled to God and exposed himself to the awful penalty of "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power."

How then can man be justified with God? "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world," that can answer this question of thrilling interest? "The heavens declare the glory of God," but no sun or star, in the glowing firmament of "his handy work," proclaims pardon to the sinner. The wise adaptations of the works of his creation, to the natures, wants, and happiness of his creatures, show forth his beneficence; yet none of these assure us that he has "found a ransom" for the perishing. Natural conscience is "accusing, or else excusing" us, but it speaks no forgiveness for the guilty. None of the sons of men, with all their wealth or power, "can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him."

Hear O ye heavens and give ear O earth. "SALVATION IS OF THE LORD." Hark! Jehovah himself declares "the joyful sound." "Deliver him from going down to the pit: I HAVE FOUND A RANSOM." "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth on him shall not be confounded." Isa. 28: 16. 1 Peter 2: 6.

Our Father in Heaven is, in the highest sense, the ATONER or RECONCILER.

"All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself," &c. 2 Cor. 5: 18; "reconciling the world unto himself," &c. 19th ver. "I, even I, am the Jehovah and beside me there is no Savior." Isa. 43: 11; Hosea 13: 4. "The high God their Redeemer." Ps. 78: 35. "—his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts." Isa. 44: 6.

Any theory which implies that God is implacable and unwilling to forgive, when forgiveness can be manifested consistently with righteousness—any system which represents that there is, in the universe, any person more merciful than the FATHER OF MERCIES himself, is a profane impeachment of the character of the Holy One. "GOD IS LOVE." "Have I

any pleasure at all that the wicked should die, saith the Lord God." Ezek. 18: 23. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." Ezek. 33: 11.

Yet he is "the just God" as well as the Savior. "God is light, in him is no darkness at all." The harmony of his perfections constitutes the glory of his character. Inviting our return to him in accents of love; assuring us that he is "the Lord God gracious and merciful;" he also solemnly warns us that he "will by no means clear" the impenitent. "Our God (to such) is a consuming fire."

The grand MEDIUM of atonement or reconciliation appointed by infinite wisdom and love, is the SON of God.

In respect to this great truth, the divine testimony is plain, positive and glorious. "God—hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ." "God was IN CHRIST reconciling the world unto himself." 2 Cor. 5: 18, 19. "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren; that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make RECONCILIATION for the sins of the people." Heb. 2: 17. This glorious enterprize of atoning love, which is destined to fill the universe with the high praises of Jehovah, is accomplished, *mediately*, by the "one Lord by whom are all things." Intimately and inseparably connected with the true glory of atonement, is,

His divine nature and preeminent dignity.

He is "THE SON OF GOD:" "the ONLY begotten of the Father full of grace and truth;" "the image of the invisible God," "the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person;" "by whom also he made the worlds;" "by him all things consist."

Alas! How has this glorious truth been subverted or enveloped in absurdity and confusion by the false theories of fallible men! How is it that an intelligent mind can believe that He, whom the Spirit of Truth declares to be "the first born of every creature," Col. 1: 15; the very "*beginning*" of the creation of God," Rev. 3: 14; had no existence until the days of Cæsar Augustus? How did God create "*all things by Jesus Christ*;" Eph. 3: 9; Heb. 1: 2; if he existed not until thousands of years after they were created?

No less subversive of the divine testimony, is the contradictory dogma, that the Son of God is *that very God* whose Son he is declared to be! As well may we affirm that the Son of the President is the President himself! "God sent his Son into the world," which clearly implies that he was his Son *before* he was sent, and proves the fallacy of the theory

which denies the applicability of this term to him *previous to his incarnation*. The import of Rom. 1: 3, 4, is believed to be, that *in respect to his flesh or body*, he was of the seed of David; but *in respect to his Spirit*, which animated the body, he was the Son of God. It is not true that he was the *first born* of every creature, or "*the beginning*" of the creation of God," *as born of Mary*. The argument of the apostle, Col. 1: 15, is, that he was "*the first born* of every creature," because, "*by him were all things created*," consequently he was so *when* he created all things, or when God created all things by him. Eph. 3: 9. The terms "the first born," "the first begotten," "the only begotten," must refer to the *origin* of his existence, and clearly teach us that the proposition that he is the self-existent and supreme God is false. It denies the great truth that "there is but one God." 1 Cor. 8: 6. It contradicts his own testimony that his Father is the *ONLY* true God"—John 17: 3; "*greater than*" himself—14: 28; that he lives "*by the Father*"—John 6: 57; that all the power by which he accomplishes his blessed mission, and gives eternal life to his redeemed, is "*GIVEN him*" by the Father—John 17: 2; that he "*can do nothing of himself*"—John 5: 19; that *the Father only* knows of the day of judgment, which proves that the Son does not know it *in any nature*. Matt. 24: 36. Hear his truthful words: "I came down from heaven, *not to do mine own will*, but the will of him that sent me," Luke 22: 29. This is a two-edged sword of the Spirit of Truth, demolishing at once the two opposite extremes of error. If Jesus Christ came down from heaven, his conception in the womb of the virgin was *not the origin* of his existence. If he came down from heaven, *not to do his own will*, but the will of superior authority, he was *not the supreme God*. They who say that the Spirit, which "*came down from heaven*," which God sent into the world, was supreme God, have the confounding alternative, either to deny that the Father is supreme God or to admit that one supreme God sent another supreme God!

Far be it, however, that we should detract from the true glory of Him who is "the chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely." "For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." "In him are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell." "That in all things he might have the preeminence." He who first made him, "so much better than the angels"—Heb. 1: 4; has made him God, or ruler, over all, blessed forever." Rom. 9: 5. "For

he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him (or that he is over all) it is manifest that He is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be ALL IN ALL." 1 Cor. 15: 27, 28. Now, "angels and authorities and powers (are) made subject unto him." 1 Peter 3: 22. They are commanded to worship him, *not as the self-existent Jehovah*, but as "his first begotten." Heb. 1: 6. In this worship, "every knee" and "tongue" shall unite and confess him Lord, "to the glory of God the Father." Phil. 2: 11. The appellation of God, (given to him in a vastly superior sense than it was given to the rulers of Israel, Ps. 82: 6,) denotes the glory of his majesty on the throne of Zion. Yet, as God, he has a God, who has "anointed" him "with the oil of gladness above (his) fellows." Heb. 1: 9. The glory of "the Word," John, 1st chap., is "the glory of the only begotten of the Father;" not the glory of the unbegotten Jehovah.

This supereminent dignity and glory of the divine nature of Jehovah's appointed ATONER is essential to the fulfilment of his high mission.

"To make reconciliation"—to be the propitiatory, or mercy seat, "for the sins of the whole world," 1 John 2: 2, is a work of no ordinary magnitude. Among all the powers of heaven, thrones, dominions, cherubim and seraphim, none but "the first" and "only begotten" Son was found worthy! If any other celestial spirit had been competent would not our Father have spared his *best beloved*? No obedience, no offering, no sacrifice, but that of *his own Son*, was competent to the indispensable object of magnifying the law of God and making it honorable while transgressors are saved. "We have a GREAT HIGH PRIEST—Jesus the SON OF GOD." The efficacy of his priesthood is predicated on his *sonship*. It is the obedience unto death, of *his own Son*, which is the "offering of a sweet smelling savor" unto the God of salvation. The contradictory theory, that the Son of God is *God himself*, disqualifies him for the office of "mediator between God and men." The same objection pertains to the theory that he is *mere man*. A mediator between the parties at variance must be *distinct from both*. It is true that, because he "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh," he is called "the man Christ Jesus." Yet the fact is, that he was the Son of God before he was made flesh. If he was the *immutable* Jehovah, could he humble or *empty himself* and be-

come obedient? Phill. 2: 8. Could the *ever-living* God die? *To whom* shall the Sovereign of the universe become obedient? *To whom* shall he offer himself? If he is a *mere man*, how can his most perfect obedience be "a propitiation—for the sins of the whole world?"

The revealed object and end of God's setting forth his Son in the view of the intelligent universe, and making "his soul an offering for sin," Isa. 53: 10 is, that he might be "the just God and the Savior."

Such is the testimony of the Spirit of Truth. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God: to declare, at this time, his righteousness: *that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.*" Rom. 3: 23—26. Now if God has thus set forth his Son and made his soul, or life, an offering for sin, in order "that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," does it not follow that he *would not have been just* if he justified believers in Jesus, *without this offering*, or some equivalent measure in honor of his holy law?

It is admitted that we are saved by the Son of God, by those who deny that there is any necessary connection between our justification and his death. They affirm that he saves us by the moral influence, *on our hearts*, of his sacred precepts and the example of his holy and benevolent life and death. They affirm truth; but do they affirm the *whole truth*? Let the Spirit of truth answer. "WITHOUT SHEDDING OF BLOOD IS NO REMISSION"—Heb. 9: 22; "JUSTIFIED by his blood"—Rom. 5: 9; "having made peace through the blood of his cross"—Col. 1: 20. "And you—hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death"—22; "thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin." "He shall bear their iniquities." Isa. 53. "The son of man came to give his life a ransom for many." Mark 10: 45. "Christ died for our sins"—1 Cor. 15: 3; "delivered for our offences;" "redeemed us to God by thy blood." Rev. 5: 9. The mount of Sinai speaks *wrath*; the mount of Calvary *peace*.

If we deny the necessity of the great sacrifice, "that God might be just and the justifier of him that believeth," what is the import or significance of those sacrifices which were continually offered, and of that blood which constantly flowed

from the altar under the first covenant? "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." These "were a *figure* for the time then present;" "it was necessary that the patterns of the things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." Heb. 9: 9-23. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." "Behold the LAMB OF GOD which taketh away the sin of the world!" "By one offering he hath perfected forever them which are sanctified." Heb. 10: 14.

It may indeed be said of other philanthropists that they have laid down their lives for their brethren. But of what other can it be said that his death was a propitiatory offering "for the sins of the whole world," "that God might be just and the justifier of him which believeth?"

Righteous law, when violated, must be honored. Repentance is only doing *present* duty. It does not cancel *past* transgression. No court acquits a criminal merely because he repents. It is true that "he who confesseth and forsaketh his sin, shall find mercy." But it is not true that confessing and forsaking of sin is *the entire* ground on which he finds mercy; for "without shedding of blood there is no remission." Heb. 9: 22. The wisdom of God has appointed the *channel* in which mercy flows consistently with righteousness. "God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven." Eph. 3: 32. He indeed justifies "*freely by his grace*" or favor, but it is "*through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*." Rom. 3: 24. Therefore, all reasoning on the mercy of God and on the competency of repentance, to justify transgressors of his holy law, without the sacrifice of his Son, however plausible, is opposed to that method of salvation which infinite wisdom has determined to be the best.

The real humiliation and death of the divine Son of God is essential to atonement.

The trinitarian theory implies that God never gave his Son either to suffer or die for us; nor even a *human soul* to die for us. It implies that he gave only a *human body* to die for us. The divine nature of Jesus Christ is supposed to be as *immutable* and *impassible* as that of the Father. It is supposed that there was no real humility or suffering of the divine nature. According to this theory, all the *real* "obedience unto death" of the great Atoner, which constitutes the basis of atonement for the sins of the world, pertains *solely* to *humanity*! How inadequate the means to the end! According to the scriptures of truth, it is the surpassing dignity and

perfection of the *REAL* sufferer that gives value and efficacy to his offering. "We have a GREAT High Priest—Jesus THE SON OF GOD." What apostle or prophet ever based the greatness of our High Priest on the absurd dogma, that he is a perfect man, united, "in one person forever," with the infinite Jehovah, who did not suffer or die at all? Where, according to this theory, is that great love of God in giving *his own Son* to suffer and die for us, which his word teaches us to behold and admire? The theory robs the Cross of its glory. It is the affecting fact, that he who *really* suffered and died there, was *God's own Son*, his "*first*" and "*only* begotten," who was with him "*before the world was*," which constitutes that glory of Calvary which demands the adoring gratitude of earth, and the hallelujahs of heaven.

"The Word was made FLESH." "A BODY hast thou prepared me"—Heb. 10: 5; not a body and *another soul or spirit*. There is no divine testimony that Jesus Christ had a *human soul*. The Son of God, who "came down from heaven," was the soul or spirit of the body "*prepared*." His humiliation, *as the Son of God*, was not *illusory*. It was *real*. He was "*in the form of God*," yet he thought not that this likeness to God was a thing to be eagerly seized or retained, but "*made himself of no reputation*," "*humbled*" or *emptied himself*," &c. Such, it is believed, is the true import of this passage in the Greek. The whole connection plainly teaches a *real* change and humiliation totally incompatible with the idea of *immutable* deity. Phill. 2 chap.

As his *humiliation* was *real*, so also was his *death*. That very same *Spirit* and *Son* who was in the *form* of God, "*became obedient unto DEATH*." "*He died for our sins*." Reputed orthodoxy denies this testimony of the Eternal Spirit. It teaches that the souls of the Son of God, both human and divine, never *died*, but, in a state of living consciousness, left the inanimate body on the Cross, and passed to the heavenly glory, and was never made "*an offering for sin*." Isa. 53: 10. *Death is the opposite of life; the cessation of it. Agony is not death.* Jesus Christ says, "*I am he that liveth and was DEAD*." He not only *agonized* but "*he died for our sins*, according to the scriptures" of truth. "*He sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins*," by *dying* for us. "*He hath poured out his soul unto death*." Isa. 53: 12. From Ps. 16: 10, we learn that the soul or life of our blessed Savior was in *sheol* from his death to his resurrection. From Eccles. 9: 10, we learn that "*there is no work, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in sheol*." Infinite wisdom and love was pleased to "*make*

his soul (life) an offering for sin." He "laid down his life for us," and then had no conscious existence until "God raised him from the dead." The prophetic word—the promise of the Eternal to give his own Son to die for us—was literally fulfilled. There was no illusion or deception in the case. Thus did he who has loved us and given himself for us, "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." This was the "better sacrifice" of the new and better covenant. "The bringing in of a better hope, by the which we draw nigh unto God." Heb. 7: 19. "Herein is love," &c.

The atonement of the Son of God is the foundation of man's hope of Immortality.

Man forfeited life or existence by transgression. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Ezek. 18: 4. "The wages of sin is death;" not eternal life in misery. Immortality is not an attribute of human nature. It is an object to be sought and attained "by patient continuance in well doing." Rom. 2: 7. No passage of divine truth declares man, in the general, to be IMMORTAL. He is MORTAL. "Shall mortal man be just with God?" Job 4: 17. Immortality or eternal life is the gift of God "THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD." Rom. 6: 23. "Sin hath reigned unto death." Blessed be the God of salvation, grace shall "reign through righteousness unto eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. 5: 21. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life," &c. John 3: 36. The final destinies of men are not eternal happy and miserable life; but life and death—life and destruction—salvation and perishing. The final punishment of the wicked will be "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." 2 Thes. 1: 9. Destruction, not of happiness merely, but of "soul and body in hell," Matt. 10: 28. All the wicked will (God) destroy." Psalms 145: 20. A perfectly holy and happy universe shall succeed, to his eternal glory.

The atonement is essential to a resurrection from the tomb on which all future life depends.

"It is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not—but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad." John 11: 52. This "gathering together" is to be at "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Thes. 2: 1, who is "the resurrection and the life." Death is the extinction of life of the entire man. "The dead know not anything." "In that very day (their) thoughts perish,"

"also their love and their hatred" "is now perished." Eccles. 9: 5, 6. Are departed souls living in heaven and hell, or in Elysium and Tartarus in Hades, without knowledge, thought and affections? If the dead rise not, Jesus Christ teaches us, God would be the God of the dead, but this is not true, if the souls of the patriarchs are now living. In this case he is the God of the living though there is no resurrection. The heathenish tradition of immortal souls, divests the doctrine of the resurrection of its chief importance and glory and has induced some to deny it altogether. Yet shall the counsel of God stand.

Paul rested all his hopes of future life on this basis. 1 Cor. 15: 32. "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die." Would he have uttered such language if he believed that he possessed an immortal spiritual subsistence susceptible of life independently of the body, and capable of enjoying the glory of God forever, although the body should never rise? He assures us that "if Christ be not raised, then they also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Our resurrection depends on his. He is "the first fruits." He does not say their bodies have perished, but that "THEY" have perished; i. e. they themselves will exist no more. To say that an immortal soul can perish is a contradiction. John 6: 39 teaches that if Jesus Christ does not raise his saints from the grave he will lose them. This is not true if their souls never die.

"Return, O Lord, deliver my soul: O save me for thy mercies' sake. For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give the thanks? Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee?" Ps. 6: 4, 5; 88: 10, 11. If David expected to praise God with "nobler powers" at death he would not have offered such a plea as this for his recovery, from disease. So Hezekiah, Isa. 38: 16, 19. "So wilt thou recover me, and make me to live—for the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee—the living, the living, he shall praise thee as I do this day."

That the saints at death "do immediately pass into glory" is a human tradition manifestly opposed to the word of truth. When, according to the scriptures, are we to "enter into life"—"into the joy of (our) Lord"—to be with him—to "see him as he is" and be "like him," and "shine forth in the kingdom of (our) Father?" Not until our blessed Lord comes in his glory. "I will come again and receive you to myself,"

in,"
d of

he
path

it, it
hree
ex-
be
ath-

and
1 in
tain
him
with
thor

insti-
24,
bject
on of

: ap-
d of
After
t-of
," he
bath
stion
ho in
ensa-
rary
ness"
mand
i har-
the
m and
how-
dduce

&c. John 14: 3. For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and THEN shall he reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16: 27. "Thou shalt be recompensed (not at death) at the resurrection of the just." It is not until "Christ who is our life shall appear," that we shall "appear with him in glory." Col. 3: 4. Then, when he "shall come in his glory," he will welcome his risen and changed saints to the kingdom prepared for them. Matt. 25: 31-34. For this glory David, who "is not ascended into the heavens" looked, not to the hour of death, but to the resurrection morning. "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." Ps. 17: 15. Paul had no expectation of receiving his crown until the day of his Lord's appearing. 2 Tim. 4: 8. Indeed all the ransomed family are represented as waiting for their salvation until that day. Isa. 25: 9. "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God—to wit, THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY." Rom. 8: 18-23. "To be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven (i. e. the incorruptible body) that mortality might be swallowed up of life. 2 Cor. 5: 1-4.

Why were the Thessalonian christians directed to wait for their Savior from heaven, if they were going to heaven to him eighteen hundred years before he was to come from heaven? 1 Thes. 1: 10; 2 Thes. 3: 5.

Finally, let us solemnly examine whether our hope for ETERNITY is resting on the "foundation" which Jehovah has laid in Zion, or on that wisdom which "is foolishness with God." The importance of reconciliation to that way of salvation which the divine wisdom had determined to be essential to the manifestation of infinite righteousness, is beyond all estimation. "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God, abideth on him." Let us also seriously consider, that faith in the Cross of Christ will be of no avail (except to enhance our condemnation,) unless by it we are crucified to the world and the world unto us. Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven."

O eternal love! Save us from unbelief, that we may finally be found among the ransomed ones who "have washed their robes and made them white IN THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB."

"Blessing and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever."

FUTURE PUNISHMENT,

NOT ETERNAL LIFE IN MISERY

BUT

DESTRUCTION.

BY

HENRY GREW.

"Fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

JESUS CHRIST.

"All the wicked will he destroy." Ps. 145: 20.

PHILADELPHIA:

STEREOTYPED AT MOGRIDGE'S FOUNDRY,

No. 5 Harmony Court.

1850.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT

NOT ETERNAL LIFE IN MISERY, BUT DESTRUCTION.

THE various errors existing in the household of faith in reference to revealed truth, evincing our imperfection, the force of prejudice, the effects of erroneous education, the slothfulness of the mind, and the want of moral courage, are truly lamentable. We honor our Father in heaven and worship him acceptably, only so far as we have right conceptions of his character, his government, and his purposes. He must be worshiped "*in spirit and in Truth.*" Not in *spirit* only, but in *truth*. If we believe that God will reward or punish men contrary to his own truth, we dishonor him, notwithstanding we may, like Peter, intend to show him our sincere regard. As truth and the glory of God are inseparable, it is palpably deceptive to imagine that we glorify him by any opinion not conformable to truth. This every christian will acknowledge. Yet in our researches after truth, we are often biassed by our own preconceptions of what is most consistent with the divine perfections and government, and rest in opinions, founded in our own fallible and prejudiced reasoning about what God *must* do, instead of believing his own declarations of what he *will* do.

In our study of the oracles of divine truth, the adoption of correct principles of interpretation, is of essential importance. Without this our appeal to the word of God may only serve to confirm us in error. The obscurity in which the plainest testimony of divine truth has been enveloped by unwarrantable principles of mystical interpretation, can only be dispelled by explaining the language of the Bible, as we do that of other books. A strict adherence to this obviously correct principle, connected with a humble dependence on the promised spirit of truth, will happily diminish the diversities of views and contentions now existing in the family of the redeemed.

The writer would ever duly appreciate the respectful regard, and holy fellowship of his beloved brethren in the Lord. As that regard, and fellowship however, is valuable only so far as it is consistent with truth, he dreads a deviation from its holy principles, far more than any transient obloquy which may result from his association with those "*eccentric*" opposers of the traditions, which make void the doctrines and commandments of the Holy One, who are ever charged with bringing "*certain strange things to our ears.*" Acts 17 : 20.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

"MAN giveth up the ghost and where is he?" In vain has human reason exercised its utmost powers to answer this question of deep and thrilling interest to the intelligent mind. Philosophy has speculated and conjectured, but "the world by

(2)

wisdom knew not God," or his purposes. The all-absorbing queries, "how can man be just with God?"—what will be my future destiny? have been proposed in vain by the departing agonizing spirit, to the wisest minds unilluminated by celestial truth. From that truth the desired information beams forth in characters plain and decisive. "*The wages of sin is DEATH, but the gift of God is ETERNAL LIFE through Jesus Christ our Lord.*" "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you," &c.

The fountain of life has been opened by divine love for a rebellious world; its healing streams are flowing free and ample as the fluid which is essential to physical vitality. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." But alas! the same vile spirit of rebellion which has contemptuously resisted the righteous claims of the law of nature, and the revealed precept of perfect love, has displayed more clearly and fully its dire depravity in turning away from him who speaketh from heaven in the most affecting accents of divine compassion and mercy. Our present object is to inquire, with holy reverence, respecting that "sorer punishment" which awaits those, who, by impenitence and unbelief, tread "under foot the Son of God," and count "the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing."

The testimony of *man* is that the wicked shall be punished with *everlasting existence in misery*. The testimony of *God* is that they shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*.—2 Thess. 1 : 9.

Whether the common opinion that all men are immortal is true or false, it must certainly be admitted that it is illogical to infer such an opinion, as some do, from the simple fact of their possessing a rational and intelligent nature. A created being is necessarily dependent on his Creator who is perfectly "able to save and to destroy." He "only hath Immortality." 1 Tim. 6 : 16. The Son of God himself, who is the first born of every creature, and approximates the nearest to the eternal I AM, declared, "I live by the Father."

Nor is such an opinion any more correctly inferred from the fact that immortality is an object of universal desire. We may as well infer the doctrine of universal salvation from the same premises. Is the desire of possessing an object proof of its actual attainment? Must not the punishment of sin necessarily consist in the loss of something desired, and in the endurance of something dreaded?

But what saith the Scriptures? In vain do we search for a

single inspired declaration, that man, in the general, is immortal. The contrary is revealed. "Shall MORTAL man be just with God?" Job 4: 17. He is here represented as *mortal*; without any distinction of body, soul or spirit. It is true, that in the scriptures, the term "mortal body" is used. But it is to be observed that it is used *only* in reference to the saints to whom eternal life is given by Jesus Christ through faith in his name. If the soul or spirit of man in general, or man in general, is, in a single passage declared to be immortal, then must we indeed conclude that when he is called mortal, his body only is intended. But surely the fact that the body is *mortal*, is no proof that the soul is *immortal*. Of the saints it is said "the body is dead (i. e. must die) because of sin, but the spirit is life (why? because it is naturally immortal?) because of righteousness"—i. e. "the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ." Rom. 3: 22. Man's life, without reference to any distinction between body and spirit, was originally suspended on his obedience. "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely DIE." There was not indeed an immediate execution of the penalty. All who admit that the death of the body, or punishment of a future state, was intended in the penalty, must admit that the whole of the penalty was not immediately executed. But if God, consistently, with his word, could postpone the execution of *any part* of the penalty, he could, if he pleased, postpone the execution of *the whole*. A man judicially condemned to die, is considered as dead. Thus the Apostle said to his brethren, "the body is dead," i. e. condemned to die.

The discerning mind, unbiassed by human tradition, must perceive that in the sacred oracles, immortality is revealed, not as an object that all possess, or will possess, but as an object to be sought after and obtained by faith and "patient continuance in well doing." Rom. 2: 7. What prophet or apostle "moved by the Holy Spirit," ever told men that they have immortal souls or deathless spirits?

What is the penalty of the law? *Not life in misery, but death.* "The wages of sin is DEATH." Rom. 6: 23. "The soul that sinneth it shall DIE." Ezek. 18: 4. "Sin, when it is FINISHED, bringeth forth DEATH." James 1: 15. "They that commit such things are worthy of DEATH." Rom. 1: 32. "Why will ye DIE?" Ezek. 18: 31. "He which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from DEATH." James 5: 20. There is a sin unto DEATH." 1. John 5: 16. "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God: and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." Rev. 20: 12. And whosoever was not found

written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." 15 verse. "This is the SECOND DEATH." verse 14. Will it be said that all these expressions of death are figurative? How figurative? Of what is the *second death* figurative? Is the *first death* figurative? Let us appeal to Jesus Christ to determine whether the second death is figurative, importing eternal existence in misery; or whether it is literal, importing a destruction of being, both soul and body. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to DESTROY both *soul and body* in hell." Matt. 10: 28. Nor is this a solitary testimony. Paul solemnly assured the Philippians that the "END" of the wicked is "DESTRUCTION." Here is double testimony against the common opinion, which supposes that they will have *no end*. "What if God willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to DESTRUCTION?" Rom. 9: 22. When all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be DESTROYED FOREVER. Ps. 92: 7. If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God DESTROY. 1 Cor. 3: 17. I went into the sanctuary of God, then understood I their END, surely thou didst set them in slippery places, thou castedst them down into DESTRUCTION. Ps. 73: 17. Enter ye in at the strait gate, for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to DESTRUCTION, &c. Matt. 7: 13. Other passages reveal the same truth. Rev. 11: 18 Ps. 145: 20. Prov. 1: 27, &c. Indeed the scriptures plainly define "*everlasting punishment*," into which the wicked will certainly go, to be, not *eternal existence in misery*, but "*everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. 1: 9. How forcible is all this testimony!

In those pages which exhibit in contrast, the affecting retributions of a future state, there is a remarkable uniformity in setting in opposition, *not happy and miserable eternal life or existence; but life and death, &c.* The wages of sin is *death*, but the gift of God is *eternal life*, &c. "He that hath the Son *hath life*; and he that hath not the Son of God, *hath not life*." "If ye live after the flesh ye shall *die*; but if ye through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall *live*." "Strait is the gate," &c. "which leadeth unto *life*." "Wide is the gate," &c. "which leadeth to *destruction*." "For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ in them that are *saved*, and in them that *perish*, to the one we are the savor of *death* unto *death*; and to the other the savor of *life* unto *life*." "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap (what? immortal woe?) *corruption*; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap *life everlasting*." "And in nothing terrified by your

adversaries, which is to them an evident token of *perdition*, but to you of *salvation*, and that of God." "There is one law-giver who is able to *save*, and to *destroy*." The wicked are "vessels of wrath fitted to *destruction*," the righteous "vessels of mercy—prepared unto *glory*." "The preaching of the cross is to them that *perish*, foolishness; but unto us which are *saved*, it is the power of God."

How plainly do these passages teach, that the final destinies of men, are, not *eternal, happy and miserable life*, but *life and death—life and destruction—salvation and perishing—life everlasting and corruption—salvation and perdition*, or being lost—*glory and destruction*. In Matt. 25: 46, *life eternal* is opposed to *everlasting punishment*, but the term everlasting punishment does not necessarily imply everlasting existence, nor is this the bible definition of everlasting punishment. The positive declaration is, that it consists in "everlasting destruction," 2 Thess. 1: 9, which is literally everlasting punishment. There will be no restoration to life and felicity.

In John 5: 29, the "resurrection of life" is contrasted with the "resurrection of damnation," i. e. condemnation. In Rom. 2: 6—10, it is contrasted with "tribulation and anguish." But as the second death is preceded by condemnation and torment, and neither of these imply endless existence, these passages, in their most obvious import, are perfectly reconcilable with the idea of final destruction.

It is an argument of magnitude against the popular opinion on this solemn subject, that numerous and varied terms used in the bible to express future punishment, are, in their obvious import, opposed to life in any condition. *Death. The second death. Destruction. Perdition. Perish. Lost. Coming to an end.* The figurative passages import the same. "He will *BURN UP* the chaff with unquenchable fire." If the fire, which the husbandman puts to the chaff for the purpose of entirely destroying it, is quenched, the chaff may be partly saved. If it "shall not be quenched," it continues until it is expended by the *utter destruction* of the chaff. "Their worm dieth not." If the worm dieth, "the carcasses" (see Isa. 66: 24) are not entirely devoured; if "their worm dieth not," they are *wholly destroyed*. What unbiassed mind does not perceive that our Lord, by using these similitudes, designed to impress the minds of his disciples with the fearful truth, that a *destruction of being*—of "*body and soul*," will be the sure portion of all who prefer their own carnal gratification, to the service and joy of the kingdom of God?

Rev. 14: 11—19: 3, and 20. 10. In these passages, the term *forever*, is connected with the *torment* of the wicked, and if this term is never used to express limited duration, these pas-

sages are opposed to the numerous varied and plain divine declarations of the entire destruction of the ungodly. But is this a fact? Certainly not. It is admitted, that if the plain testimony of the bible does not contradict the literal import of the term *forever*, as applied to the torment of the wicked, we ought to understand it in its literal import, as we do when it is applied to the happiness of the righteous. But if the terms, *forever*, and *forever and ever*, which are literally synonymous, are often used to express limited duration; and the general testimony of scripture in respect to future punishment, plainly imports *destruction*, it is a violation of the just rule of interpretation, to understand the passages referred to, in their literal import. Now I affirm that these two facts are susceptible of clear proof.* After finding the term everlasting or forever, applied to the covenant of circumcision, Gen. 17: 13—to the Jewish possession of the land of Canaan, Gen. 17: 8—to a written record of the prophet, Isa. 30: 8—to the continuance of the present earth, Eccles. 1: 4—and even to Jonah's three days entombment in the fish, Jonah, 2: 6, is it astonishing to find it applied to the duration of the suffering of the wicked, which may be a long period prior to their final destruction.

Their doom will be inconceivably dreadful; the precise duration of their sufferings is not revealed. Of the fire in the land of Idumea, caused by the judgment of God against his enemies in the present state, it is written, "it shall not be quenched night nor day, the smoke thereof shall go up forever," Isa. 34: 10. So the testimony respecting Sodom, &c. "Suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," may be considered as referring to the entire destruction of those cities, by which they were "*set forth for an example*" to the world, of the fearful consequences of disobedience. But if not, the term *eternal* may be used in a limited sense, as the original word is in many places. In this limited sense the term "*everlasting fire*" must be understood, in our Lord's declaration, "it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet, to be cast into everlasting fire." Here, being cast into everlasting fire is set in opposition to entering into *life*. But if the sinner is to *live forever* in this fire, he enters into *life* as much as

* Mr. Dwight and Mr. Hawes, have represented that "the terms 'everlasting,' 'forever,' and the like, are uniformly used in the scriptures to denote the *longest possible duration, of which the subject to which they are applied is capable*." Reasons, &c., page 18. As if the "everlasting covenant" of circumcision could not *possibly* be in the flesh of the Jews; or the "everlasting possession" of the land of Canaan be their habitation, to this day! As if the bars of the earth encompassing Jonah "forever," could not *possibly* have been a longer period than three days!

s.—
an,"
d of

" he
bath

ct, it
hree
ex-
t be
bath-

and
d in
stain
him
with
athor

insti-
24,
object
on of

r ap-
nd of
After
it—of
," he
bbath
estion
rho in
pensa-
ory
ness"

mand
n har-
at the
m and
, how-
adduce

if he should enter paradise. *Eternal life* is his portion in either case, though the *quality* of it is vastly different. "He that believeth not the Son, shall not see *life*, but the wrath of God abideth on him." If it abideth on him to utter *destruction*, he shall not see eternal life, otherwise he will. It is said that "no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him;" but if the murderer has an immortal soul abiding in him, he has eternal life abiding in him as certainly as the holiest saint on earth, only of a different kind. The scriptural terms "everlasting fire," "unquenchable fire," import a fire which shall *utterly destroy*. No other construction of these terms, can be reconciled with the divine testimony—with the penalty of the law, which is *DEATH*—with the definition of the sinner's punishment, as consisting in "everlasting destruction;" or with our Lord's instruction, that this destruction is not a destruction of *happiness*, but of *body and soul*.

Some affirm that when the term forever is applied to things of the *present state*, it is to be understood in a limited sense, but that when it is applied to things pertaining to a *future state*, it is to be understood in its literal import. Let us test this argument. Does not all its force rest upon the principle, that things in a future state are *necessarily endless*? Is this principle true? Certainly not. It is no more true that every thing which succeeds the present state shall necessarily have no end, than it is true that all things which preceded it had necessarily no beginning. We know that other beings began to exist before the present state. Nor is there anything in the nature of things, which proves that dependent beings may not cease to exist after it. All depends on the will of God. If the general tenor of scripture testimony respecting future punishment, is in favor of a destruction of being, this argument, and *all others* must fall before it.

Some suppose that by the destruction of the wicked, is intended the destruction of their *sins*; others, the destruction of their *happiness*. The destruction of sin—of happiness—of being, are entirely distinct ideas: each is susceptible of definite intelligent expression by appropriate language. How could our Lord express the latter idea more definitely, than he has in Matt. 10: 28? "Fear him which is able to *destroy both soul and body in hell*." If this passage, which is so particular and definite, is considered in connection with 2 Thess. 1: 9; Ps. 92: 7; Ps. 73: 17, &c., is it possible for an unbiassed mind to reject the import advocated? The doctrine is taught in both testaments.

Another argument is offered to the consideration of such as desire emancipation from the mental slavery of human systems, in the fact, that, in the scriptures of truth, *no qualifying ad-*

jectives are ever affixed to the terms eternal life and immortality, denoting *different kinds* of eternal life or immortality.

Simple immortality—simple eternal life, is invariably represented as a blessing. If the common opinion is the truth, it would have been as necessary for the inspired writers, as it is for modern preachers, to make a distinction between a *blessed* and a *curse* immortality. The effects of sin and grace are not *miserable and happy* eternal life; but *death and eternal life*. "The wages of sin is *death*, but the gift of God is *eternal life*, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

It deserves the serious consideration of every one, who trembles at the thought of bearing false witness for God, whether the occurrence of the term forever, &c., in connection with the actual torment of the wicked, in a very few passages, can justify us in rejecting the obvious sense of all those numerous divine declarations, which plainly teach in various terms the purpose of the Almighty, that "all the wicked will he destroy?" Ps. 145: 20. Which, we ask; is most accordant with correct rules of interpretation, to insist upon the literal import of the term forever, (often used to express a limited duration,) and give a figurative construction to the terms death, second death, destruction, perdition, lost, coming to an end, &c.; or to admit the obvious import of these terms, and of our Lord's instruction, that the wicked are to be destroyed body and soul, and understand the term forever, in a few passages, (in some of which it is connected with *day and night*), in a limited sense?

The affixing of the term *spiritual* to the term death, as the penalty of the law, is confounding the *penalty* with the *crime*. Spiritual death is to be "*dead in trespasses and sins*." This is the sinner's *guilt*, and distinct from the *penalty*. To say that the wages of sin is *spiritual* death, is to say that the wages of sin is *sin*.

The proper import of the term death is the cessation of life, or conscious being. Its import is the same whether applied to the body or spirit. Death is the opposite of life. Like other words it is sometimes used in a figurative, or metaphorical sense. The spirit may die or cease to exist, as may the body. On the all sustaining arm of the Infinite all his creatures are dependent for life, and all things.

Although great caution is to be observed in reasoning concerning what is, and what is not, consistent with the perfections of *Him* who "holdeth back the face of his throne and spreadeth his cloud upon it," we may with holy admiration trace the harmony existing between his revealed perfections and his revealed purposes. Let it now be candidly considered whether the entire destruction of the sinner, subsequent to such degrees of torment as the degree of his guilt shall require, is not far

more consistent with the revealed character of our Father in heaven, than the doctrine of interminable miserable existence. The supposition that God will hold his enemies in endless miserable existence, simply because he is *able* to do it, is an impeachment of his character which will not be advocated. God's power is ever regulated by his benevolence and justice. It is argued that sin is an infinite evil, and requires an infinite punishment. To prove that this principle furnishes no argument against the plain construction given in these pages to the divine declaration, "the wages (i. e. the desert) of sin is *death*;" it is sufficient to remark, that it is as evident that the everlasting destruction of a finite being, capable of the eternal knowledge and enjoyment of the Infinite, is an *infinite punishment*; as it is, that rebellion against the Infinite, by a *finite* being is an *infinite evil*. God will punish no more than justice requires. Such is his compassion and benevolence he does this only from moral necessity. The voice of infinite love expostulates with the most incorrigible "why will ye *die*?" Will divine justice be dishonored—will holy intelligences discern any connivance at iniquity—any violation of law—when the righteous Judge of all, after having apportioned different degrees of bodily and mental misery to the wicked according to their degrees of guilt, shall destroy "body and soul for ever?" Because this is not so terrible as interminable miserable existence, does it present an inadequate motive for repentance or diminish the proper restraints of sin? Is a father to be charged with presenting his disobedient child with an inadequate motive, because he does not threaten him with the greatest evil he can possibly inflict? Will you charge Legislatures with not properly restraining crime, because they will not consign all criminals to the tortures of the rack during their present existence? What unbiassed mind does not perceive a sufficient appeal to the fears of sinful and accountable men, and an adequate motive to all who will act upon rational principles, in the threatening of the loss of all the glory of immortality, and of enduring torments which shall issue in total destruction? If the loss of all those emanations of the wisdom, power, and love of the Infinite, which the sinner will be incapacitated eternally to behold and enjoy, *if he will repent*, together with the actual suffering of protracted, unutterable torment of body and mind antecedent to utter destruction, are considerations inadequate to bear on an intelligent mind and induce repentance; will even the expectation of endless torment be adequate? Is it so in fact? If it is said that although it never is so, without the influence of the Spirit of God; yet it is more likely to be so with that influence, because it is more horrible; I ask reverently is it most likely that the God of truth will honor truth or a lie?

The objector proceeds upon a principle which implicates himself, if he admits of degrees of punishment; and what is far more serious, he implicates Jesus Christ in the charge of diminishing the proper restraints of sin. The principle is, that the proper restraint to sin, is *the threatening of the greatest possible punishment*. So that when Jesus Christ declared that some should "be beaten with *few stripes*," he deprived such persons of the proper restraint of sin! When shall we cease to be wise above what is written? The supposition that the Almighty restrains sin to the utmost of his power is contrary to his word and to fact. Is he to be charged with not properly restraining iniquity, "because sentence against an evil work is not speedily executed," in consequence of which, "the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil?" or because he does not convert all men to holiness? or because he does not *immediately destroy* the incorrigible. God is not man, that he should be the victim of caprice, or passion, or power. "Righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne." In governing his moral universe and awarding destinies, he is regulated, not by his *power*, but by his *justice and benevolence*. All who admit *degrees* of future punishment, necessarily believe that God will punish millions of men *less* than he is able to do. After all our reasoning, it is obvious, that sin cannot be more effectually restrained or excluded from the dominions of the Almighty, than by the final destruction of his incorrigible enemies. Our belief exhibits the glorious scene of a perfectly holy and happy universe, without that sacrifice of justice, and without that inadequate expression of God's displeasure against sin which the doctrine of universal salvation manifestly implies.

The scriptural and rational doctrine of *degrees of punishment* is perfectly reconcilable with final destruction of being, — as it will be preceded by such different degrees of suffering as divine justice shall determine.

It has been asked, with more *wit* than *reason*, "Is it possible that God should *threaten* them (the wicked) with putting an end to their miseries?" We believe no such statement. The object of God's *threatening* is not "putting an end to their miseries," but to *their being*, and consequently to all hope of life and felicity. An end to their conscious misery is indeed necessarily involved in the threatening. So the threatening of a certain term of imprisonment for crime, implies a release at the expiration of such term. But who ever considered such release as any part of the *threatening*?

It is supposed from Matt. xxv. 41, "that the punishment of wicked men will be the same as that of wicked angels, and that if the devils could persuade themselves that they should be utterly destroyed, they would believe and be at ease rather than

s.—
an,"
nd of

" he
bath

ct, it
three
ex-
t be
bath-

, and
d in
stain
him
with
uthor

insti-
i. 24,
bject
on of

r ap-
nd of
After
it—of
," he

bbath
estion
ho in
pensa-
orary
ness"

mand
n har-
at the
mand
, how-
dduce

tremble." Let us hear them on this subject. "Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to *destroy* us?" Mark 1, 24. Luke 4, 34. If the expectation of *destruction* would set them "*at ease*," why did they cry out, "*Let us alone*?" Why did they not cry out, *welcome thou destroyer*? If their own testimony is to be admitted (and they sometimes spoke the truth) it must be acknowledged that they expect to be both additionally tormented and destroyed.—Matt. 8, 29. Mark 1, 24. If this testimony is inadmissible, that of an inspired witness must not be rejected. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might *destroy* him that had the power of death, that is, *the devil*," &c. Heb. 2, 14. It is indeed easy to say, that this means that *his works* shall be destroyed, but how is it *proved*? Is it by a single declaration of truth that he shall exist forever? May not *his works* be destroyed, and *himself also*? That both will be destroyed appears to be revealed. See 1 John 3, 8. Heb. 2, 14. By what authority then do we deny either?

Prejudice only will affirm that these views have any connexion with the error of universal salvation, or imply the least tendency towards such a delusion. If we are chargeable with favoring such a device of the arch adversary, because we deny that God will punish men to the extent of his power, the believer in endless misery, who allows degrees therein, is chargeable with the same. It is no uncommon thing for erring man to pass from one extreme to another. That the preaching of the popular opinion has driven many to the opposite extreme of universal salvation is believed. Whether it is so or not, or whatever doctrine in our fallible opinion, is best adapted to restrain or punish sin, the determining question is—what hath God said? What is the chaff to the wheat?

If any are disposed to accuse us, because we believe that the "fiery indignation," which a righteous God has threatened, "shall *devour* the adversaries;" let them pause, and seriously consider, lest they be found even charging God foolishly.

With all this evidence before me, tell me not of "deathless spirits" and "immortal souls" *out of* "the book of *life*." Who-soever is not found there, will be "cast into the lake of fire," which is the "SECOND DEATH." Are any of us speculating on this awful subject and withholding our hearts from our Maker? Let us agonize to enter into life. The overwhelming conviction that God, and heaven, and immortality with its inconceivable glories, are lost—ALL, FOREVER LOST, by voluntarily preferring the world to God, will be the bitterest ingredient in the last cup of agony of the expiring soul!

s.—
an,"
nd of

" he
bath

ct, it
hree
ex-
t be
bath-

, and
d in
stain
him
with
uthor

insti-
i. 24,
bject
on of

r ap-
nd of
After
t—of
," he
bath
estion
ho in
ensa-
orary
ness"
mand
a har-
t the
m and
how-
dduce

REVIEW.

Br. Phelps' arguments are designed to establish two points.—
1. That the sabbath-day was and is "perpetually binding on man," on all men, on "*the race*," from the creation until the end of time. 2. Yet he advocates a change of the day.

Page 16, in reference to "the friends of the sabbath" he remarks, "learning as they do, all they know of the sabbath *from the bible*," &c.

Affirming the first of these points to be a scriptural fact, it must be admitted that the writer was bound to do one of three things: to adduce, "*from the bible*," either a *precept* or an *example*, or the performance of something *which could not be performed without the existence and observance of the sabbath-day, as he advocates it*.

Now I affirm, that Br. P. has done neither of these things, and consequently, whatever imperfection he may have detected in the reasoning of his opponents, he has failed entirely to sustain his own position. If any one doubts this, I respectfully ask him to open the book, and find, if he can, a single compliance with either of these requisites. I ask, for the truth's sake, the author himself to do this.

P. 19. He affirms, "Like marriage, it (the sabbath) was instituted at creation." What is the scriptural fact? *Gen. ii. 24*, contains a *plain and positive direction to man*, on the subject of marriage. *Gen. ii. 2, 3*, contains no direction or requisition of any kind, relative to man.

Instead of sustaining his position by a divine precept or approved example, he offers his own ideas of propriety and of "man's moral necessities," in relation to the subject. After stating the fact of "the arrangement of day and night—of earth and seas—of seasons and years, for man—the race," he asks, "Why then, should the arrangement of the sabbath be an exception?" A very satisfactory answer to this question is found in subsequent revelation of the will of God, who in his own wisdom, connected the sabbath-day with the dispensation of types and shadows, which was to be of temporary duration and to give place to "the ministration of righteousness" which exceeds in glory. The postponement of the command to man, and the limitation of it to a particular people, is in harmony with the plain declaration of God's own word that the sabbath was given to the Israelites, as a sign between Him and them. *Exod. xxxi. 12, 13*, *Ezek. xx. 12, 20*. Be this, however, as it may, our author's appropriate work, is to adduce

scriptural evidence for what he affirms *God has done*, and not to require of us reasons for his not doing what he *has not done*.

He thinks that it is not surprising that in the history of twenty-five hundred years, there should be no mention of the sabbath, and remarks (p. 32,) "in the entire histories of Joshua, of the Judges, of Samuel and of Saul,—a period of about five hundred years—the sabbath is not mentioned once."

"Had they no sabbath then?" I reply that we should have no reason to believe that they had, if, *as in the time previous to their leaving Egypt*, there was no command given them to keep it. We do not argue *merely* from the fact of there being no recorded example, but from the fact of there being *neither precept or example*, for this positive institution, that it was not obligatory during that period. We know that the observance of the sabbath was obligatory during the five hundred years, *because we find a previous command to keep it*.

But he adds, "I deny the fact asserted." The fact asserted by me and quoted by Br. P. is, that "the bible contains no example of any man keeping a sabbath before the time of Moses." To sustain this denial reference is made to *Gen. ii. 2, 3*. Does this passage contain an example of any man keeping a sabbath? Does it contain *any command to any man*? Of what avail is it to "deny the fact asserted," when not a single word of divine truth is quoted which can sustain the denial? Instead of doing this, a statement is made of various particular acts which we should expect to find recorded "on the supposition of a sabbath" existing, *every one* of which might have been performed without a sabbath. These acts are "the patriarchs meeting together at stated times for religious worship,"* building altars unto the Lord—the command to Noah "of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by *sevens*"—a mourning of seven days for Jacob—"seven ewe lambs"—a token of a covenant, *Gen. xxi. 30*,—Job's sacrifice of "seven bullocks and seven rams," *Job. xlii. 8*—"a division of time into weeks." Now as all these things could have been done without a sabbath-day, how can they afford proof of its existence? It is not to be denied that Abraham and Enoch might walk with God—that

* *Gen. iv. 26*, "is rightly translated (says Professor Stuart). 'Then was a commencement made of calling, &c.'" This certainly does not necessarily import "social and public" worship. Admitting, however, that it does, it affords no proof of sabbath-day; for the Professor truly remarks, "When—is not said." But how shall we account for the fact that men never "began" "to call on the name of the Lord," in a social and public manner, until two hundred and thirty years after the supposed institution of the sabbath for their observance?

Isaac might go out at eventide to meditate on the glorious works and gracious providence of his Father in heaven—that the patriarchs might build altars to his praise, and hold holy and blessed communion with him,—that they might meet at stated times to worship him, without the institution of a sabbath-day. How many christians now meet, as did the primitive christians, for divine worship on the first-day of the week, who obey the Apostolic injunction, "Let no man therefore judge you in respect of a holy day,—or of the sabbath-days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ!" *Col. ii. 13, 16*.

The "division of time into weeks," cannot determine the question before us. Could not time be divided into weeks of seven days whether one or more or none of those days are a sabbath-day? The Jews had other sabbaths, notwithstanding such division. It is asked (p. 40,) "Did the Hebrew, when he so described the month (i.e. by *hodesh yamim*, literally, "a new moon of days") give proof, in the very form of his expression, of the evidence and regular return of the new moon? So (it is affirmed) when he described the week, (by *shibath yamim*) as a "seventh of days," he gave equal proof of the existence and regular return of the sabbath." Now the *main thing* requisite to constitute the "equal proof" is wanting. In the first expression *the word moon is literally found*, but in the second *the word sabbath is not found*. It is not possible that there can be "*hodesh yamim*," i. e. "a new moon of days," without a moon; but there may be "*shibath yamim*" i. e. a seventh of days without a sabbath. If what is *assumed* could be proved, viz.—that the patriarchs were required to observe every seventh day as a sabbath, then indeed "a heptade" or "seventh of days" would have been the regular return of the sabbath, but the mere expression of "heptade" or "seventh of days," is no more proof of the existence of the sabbath, than the mere expression of thirty days is of the existence of the moon.

P. 52. *Exod. v. 5*, is quoted. "Behold the people are many, and ye make them rest from their burdens"—"literally (Br. P. remarks (*hishbattem*) "ye cause them to sabbatize, or keep sabbath from their burdens." Will he say that there is here any reference to the seventh-day sabbath? Will he say that *hishbattem*, or sabbatize does not here signify simply "rest," as it is rendered in our version? (p. 51) he himself acknowledges that the Israelites, when in Egypt, had "no sabbath," and (p. 56) affirms "that they could not keep it there."

He remarks, (p. 42) "Practically then, as a means to its ap-

propriate *end*, the great question at issue between God and Pharaoh, in respect to the deliverance of the Israelites, was that of the sabbath, with its connected privileges and rights." Does Moses say this, or anything which implies it? In all his interviews with Pharaoh, not a word of complaint of their having been deprived of the sabbath-day,—not a word about the sabbath, as a reason why he should let them go, is recorded. We know indeed, from subsequent testimony, that God designed to give them the sabbath in the wilderness, and that *to them* it was an important command. As to "the great question at issue between God and Pharaoh," let us hear the word of the Lord. "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh: thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my first-born. And I say unto thee let my son go *that he may serve me.*" *Exod. iv. 22, 23.* Suppose however that God had informed Moses, and Moses had informed Pharaoh, that the people must go to keep the sabbath in the wilderness, this certainly would be no proof that they had kept it *previously*. If the feast referred to by Moses, *Exod. v. 1*, was the sabbath-day, (of which there is no conclusive proof) it would not follow that it was God's design "to *restore* the sabbath to his people." This is *assuming* the very point to be proved, viz. that they had it *previously*. Instead of proving this from the bible, Br. P. finds it more convenient to give us the following paraphrase. "Remember that thou wast a servant once in the land of Egypt, where thou wouldst have been glad of such a day of rest, but couldst not have it; and that the Lord thy God, brought thee out thence that thou mightest have it. Therefore, because he has done all this to give it back to you, he has commanded you anew to keep it." (p. 55.) We will compare this paraphrase with the word of the Lord, and see whether or not it is adding thereto or diminishing therefrom. "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand; and by a stretched-out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath-day." An unscriptural theory, *and none other*, needs an *alteration* of scripture to sustain it. Human tradition is interwoven in the paraphrase in the words, "commanded you anew to keep it," and in the words, "give it back to you," words which we see are an addition to the testimony of the Eternal Spirit! What can we not prove by such a method?

It is asked, (p. 54,) "Why this reference? (i. e. to the bondage in Egypt,) *not*, surely, to give the reason for the original institution of the sabbath, for that is given (*Exod. xx. 11*),

thus—'For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; *wherefore* (because he did this, not because he brought the Hebrews out of Egypt,) the Lord blessed the sabbath-day and hallowed it.' To make the passage before us give another and different reason is to involve the bible in contradiction."

There is no contradiction between the two passages, understanding them in their obvious import. The one passage informs us that God, after creating all things in six days, rested on the seventh, and, *therefore*, blessed and hallowed it. The other, that God commanded the Israelites to keep it, because he brought them out of Egypt with a mighty hand. What contradiction is there here? The day he blessed and sanctified, because in it he rested from all his work, he commanded the Israelites, rather than other nations, to keep, because he delivered them, and not others, from their cruel bondage. "You only have I known of all the nations of the earth," *Amos iii. 2*. Can there not be more than one reason for doing a thing, without contradiction? There is no necessity for giving "the term *al-ken*" a different rendering to avoid contradiction. It is not implied that the deliverance from Egypt was any reason for God's resting on the seventh-day.

Br. P. supposes that the sabbath, as a memorial of deliverance from Egyptian bondage, "has *no significance*." (page 57.) No significance! Was not the sabbath a day of rest? Was it not then a most appropriate memorial of the divine goodness to them in hearing and answering their cry when under the iron yoke of bondage? Was it not a season peculiarly adapted to call forth their grateful acknowledgments and high praises to their great DELIVERER who had given them REST from their hard and cruel toil?

Exod. xvi. 29: Ezek. xx. 11, 12: and Neh. ix. 13, 14, it is supposed, do not prove that the sabbath was *first* given to man in the wilderness. (p. 61.) It is freely admitted "that laws and institutions are sometimes said to be given when they are merely re-established." Only produce the evidence from the bible of the *previous* establishment of the Sabbath as an ordinance given to man for his observance, and these passages shall not be adduced as evidence against such a fact. But in the absence of all such evidence, I affirm that these passages are perfectly appropriate to express the idea of an original gift of the sabbath to man. It is written, "Moses *gave* you circumcision, not that it is of Moses, (i. e. originally,) but of the fathers." Why is this last clause added, if the first does not seem to imply that it was ori-

Because they had been a servant

ginally of Moses? *Exod. xvi. 29*, it is written, "SEE for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath," &c. Neither here nor in any other of the passages quoted is there the least intimation as in the case of circumcision, that "the fathers" had the sabbath.

Our author is very ingenious in supposing what ought to have been done, which is not done, on the supposition that the sabbath was *first* given to the Israelites, *Exod. xvi. 23, 29*. To all which it is sufficient to reply, that enough was said by Moses on that occasion for them to know and do their duty in respect to the subject. About a month afterward the fourth commandment was given from Mount Sinai.

But the law of the sabbath "is in the decalogue." How then can its "perpetuity" be questioned? It is positively declared by Moses, *Deut. v. 3*, that the covenant which included the decalogue, "was not made with (their) fathers," but with those who were alive that day.* It is as positively declared by the apostle Paul that the same covenant or law "*is done away*," *2 Cor. iii. 11*; that it is "*dead*," *Rom. vii. 6*, that believers in Christ Jesus are "*not under*" it, *Rom. vi. 15*; that they "*are delivered from*" it, *Rom. vii. 6*; and that the Sabbath itself was "*a shadow*," *Col. ii. 7*. So much for "perpetuity." Let us cast these testimonies of the *Spirit of truth* into the scale and try their weight against the *tradition of men*, that the sabbath was given at the creation to the entire race of man, and that it is to continue "until the last economy," "and time gives place to eternity."

It is supposed by some that it is only the *ceremonial* law that is done away. Let us again appeal to the Word of the Lord, *1 Cor. iii. 6—11*, Paul assures us that it was the "letter," or law, *written and engraven in stones*, which "*is done away*," *Exod. xxxi. 18*, we read, "and he gave unto Moses when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, *tables of stone* written with the finger

* (P. 70), it is remarked. "Whatever, then, the declaration, that it (the covenant) was not made with the fathers, proves in respect to one part of it, as for instance, the law of the sabbath, it equally proves in respect to every part. If it proves that the patriarchs had no sabbath—it proves equally that they had no God," &c. This reasoning is specious but it is not sound. — The declaration cannot possibly refer to the being of God, or to the duty of worshipping him, or to the obligation of moral principles; for the knowledge of these does not depend on any special covenant. They are founded in the nature and relation of beings and things. See *Rom. i. 20, 21. ii. 14, 15*. But the reference must pertain to something in the covenant which their fathers had not. Nothing remains to which it can refer, but positive institutions one of which was the sabbath-day. Nothing but plain divine testimony of its *previous* enactment, and that the fathers had it (which neither br. P. or any other man has adduced) can warrant us in making it an exception.

of God." *Exod. xxxiv. 28*, we read, "And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, *the ten commandments*." See also *Deut. v. 22, Rom. vii. 6, 7*. The latter passage declares that it is the law which said "*Thou shalt not covet*," which is done away, or is "dead."

It is asked (p. 11.) "Is it then done away in Christ as a rule of duty?" If it is not, then it is not true that it is "dead," or that we are "delivered from" it, and are "not under it," as the apostle declares. He teaches not merely that we are not *under condemnation*, but that we are not *under the law*. He teaches that the law is no more "*a rule of life*" to those who are married to Christ, than the law forbidding a woman marrying another while her husband is living, is her rule of life when her husband is dead. *Rom. vii.* Is it still objected, then are we without law? The apostle anticipated such an objection and refuted it. How? By admitting that we are under the law as "*a rule of duty*." Nay, verily, but by affirming that we are under *another law*, "*under the law to Christ*." Why then did Br. P. ask "What law is there when the law is done away?" (p. 12.) It is remarkable that the apostle's inference from this doctrine is the very reverse of that of such an objector. "For sin (says he,) shall not have dominion over you, (why not? Is it because ye are under the law as 'a rule of duty'?) No.) For ye are *not under the law*, but under grace. What then! shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." *Rom. vi. 14, 15*. How plain is the apostolic teaching on this subject! "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions *till the seed* (Christ) *should come* to whom the promise was made—before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But *after that faith is come*, we are no longer under a school-master." *Gal. iii. 19—25*.

On supposition that the law is done away, as a rule of duty, it is still asked, "how does it appear that we are not equally 'under law to Christ,' to keep the sabbath?" This certainly is a very proper question, and the proper answer to it is, that in the law of Christ *there is no such requisition*. Far be it from any of us to disregard any law of Zion's rightful King. What is the law of the "Lord of the sabbath-day?" "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." *Col. ii. 16, 17*. Surely there is evidence enough against the "perpetuity" advocated

1. The law containing the commandment respecting the sabbath "*is done away*," &c.

2. The command itself is specially and particularly repealed. Col. ii. 16, 17.

3. Neither that or any other law requiring the observance of a sabbath day is found in the law of Christ.

Respecting the sabbath *as a sign* it is remarked, (p. 75,) "Either they had the sabbath before, or it was not a distinctive sign of their distinctive existence as God's chosen people. But it *was* such a sign. They had the sabbath then from the beginning. This conclusion is unavoidable." It is here conceded that the sabbath *was* such a *distinctive sign*. A concession which subverts the theory, that it was given to the whole "race" of man. It does *not* follow that they must necessarily have had it from their first separation from other nations, in order to have been a distinctive sign. Was not the temple such a sign, although it was not built until a long time afterwards? But the fact is, *the Israelites never were separated from the nations of the earth*, until they left Egypt, immediately after which the sabbath was given them as a sign.

Respecting quotations from Homer, Hesiod, Lucian, &c., we have but one word. *Inadmissible*. We ask for quotations from Jesus Christ and his inspired apostles.

In the following quotation the critical reader will notice with disapprobation the puerile and uncharitable substitute for scriptural argument demanded in the case. (p. 93.) "Where are the debauchees and the profligates," &c., "once dead in trespasses and sins, but now born again and reclaimed, and ready to stand up and testify that they have been plucked from ruin by the no-sabbath men and the no-sabbath views? Are the men—is the man so renovated and reclaimed to be found? I, at least, have yet to see him." And "I, at least, have yet to see" the man whom I know to have been converted to God by the instrumentality of my beloved brother Phelps: Is not this conclusive proof that his view of the sabbath is erroneous, although in fact he may have been honored of God as his servant in saving many souls? I shall not allow him to compel me to "become a fool in boasting," but I will assure him that among the many devoted and successful servants of Jesus Christ with whom I have been acquainted for half a century, I know of none whose labors of holy love have been more signally crowned with the divine blessing than those of the very character he traduces. When the Lord comes in his kingdom, he will see them shining therein, "as the sun in the firmament, and as the

stars for ever and ever." Truly this is a notable and pitiable example of the baneful power of prejudice; to suppose that a belief of God's plainly revealed truth, that the sabbath was "*a shadow of things to come*," disqualifies us for his holy and blessed service—to suppose that christians who acknowledge their obligation to meet on the first day of the week for divine worship, or if they do not, who believe that all their time should be holy unto the Lord, and who find their highest joy in declaring the glad tidings of salvation to their fellow dying men, are laboring in vain in the Lord, because they do not believe that any particular day is the sabbath!

CHANGE OF THE DAY.

Let us now examine the argument for the change of the day. The question is thus stated by br. P. (p. 96.) "*Has the first day of the week been set apart, by divine appointment, to be observed, in the place of the seventh, as the sabbath? Has God authorized the change?*" That he has, I shall attempt to prove."

To affirm the "*perpetuity*" of the original sabbath and also a "change of the day," is a *contradiction*. That it is the *original* sabbath, the perpetuity of which is advocated by br. P., is manifest from the following quotation. "It (the sabbath) was instituted when they (i. e. 'the arrangement of day and night—of earth and seas,' &c.) were instituted, and like them was designed to be as universal in its existence, and as perpetual in its obligation, as the race itself." p. 22.

The *particular day* enters into the very essence of the original sabbath. Any *change* of the day annihilates it. *Another day is another institution*. Now for the proof. "God blessed the *seventh* day and sanctified it; *because* that *in it* he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii. 3. The reason and the *only* reason assigned for the original institution of the sabbath-day is, that God rested on the *seventh* day, and *no other*, from all his work. Now, as God's resting on *that particular day* constitutes the *entire ground* of its sanctification as the sabbath-day, it necessarily follows that a change of the day involves a *nullification* of the *original institution*. Br. P.'s own reasoning confirms this. (P. 87,) he remarks, "*manente ratione, manet ipsa lex*—the reason of the law remaining, the law itself remains." But the reason of the law was God's resting on the *seventh* day, a fact which certainly remains, consequently the law requiring the observance of *that particular day* must remain so long as the institution itself remains. The fourth of July is observed as

a memorial of American Independence, because *on that day* it was declared. Can you change the day, and then talk of the "perpetuity" of your original memorial? Moreover, *the day* is not only changed, but *the reason for observing* your new sabbath-day is changed. The first day of the week is not kept because *IN IT God rested from the works of creation*, but because our blessed Lord rose from the dead. Suppose we were to abandon the observance of the fourth of July, and say we will keep the eighth of January instead, because of Jackson's victory, could we in truth declare that we are maintaining the "perpetuity" of the original instituted memorial of independence?

To say that God sanctified the seventh day as the sabbath, because he requires a seventh part of time, is to say what is not true. It is to say, not only what is not to be found in the bible, but what contradicts the recorded facts of that holy volume of truth. God required the strict observance of other sabbath-days besides that of the seventh day.

It is really preposterous for the advocates of the first day sabbath to pretend that they are maintaining the perpetuity of the original institution, when in fact, the *day*—the *reason* for observing it—the *manner* of observing it, and the *penalty* of its violation, are all disregarded and abandoned. Br. P. writes that we should "keep the first day of the week as sabbath with all the sacredness of original obligation," (p. 97.) What was that obligation? It was to refrain from all manner of work—from kindling a fire—from gathering any fuel—from traveling more than a sabbath-day's journey, which was less than one mile, and that the sabbath-breaker should be put to death! Where now are *such* sabbath keepers? Who is regarding the sacredness of "*original obligation*?" Who is there that ought not to be stoned to death according to that obligation? Why does not br. P. maintain that obligation and the honor of the law by advocating the execution of the penalty on transgressors?

Our author seems to be aware of the discrepancy of advocating the "*perpetuity*" of the original institution, and also a "change of the day." To obviate it, he remarks, (p. 98,) "The great burden of the injunction is, to keep sabbath day holy, be it what day of the week it may." This assertion, unsustained by a single passage of scripture, is proved to be a violation of truth, by the fact that the only reason assigned why God sanctified *any day at all* as a sabbath, both in *Gen.* ii. 2, 3, and in the fourth commandment, is, his resting from

his works on the *seventh* day. He "blessed the *SEVENTH* day, because that *IN IT* he had rested," &c. Does not the *great reason* constitute "the *great burden* of the injunction?" Does not this great and only reason most clearly establish the seventh day, and exclude every other as an entire subversion of the original institution?

A remarkable concession, which appears to me to nullify all attempts to prove, from the New Testament, a change of the sabbath-day, is found, (p. 155.) It is, that the first day of the week "was never called sabbath until centuries afterward," i. e. after the time of the ministry of Jesus Christ and his apostles. It is not conceivable that such a change could be made by them without declaring, in some terms, that the first day of the week is the sabbath. It will not remove the difficulty to say that the first day of the week might be established as the sabbath, although it was not so denominated, by the requisition of the same duties on that day as were required in the old sabbatical law, for this is not true. Neither Jesus Christ or his apostles ever gave any command forbidding men to do any manner of work on the first day—to carry any burden—to kindle a fire in their habitations, nor to offer burnt sacrifices. Neither did they ever command the observance of any sabbath day, or ever condemn men for sabbath-breaking. The sabbath-day was a positive institution. If it was the will of Jesus Christ to establish the first day of the week as such, the nature of the case required a plain and positive declaration thereof. It was so in the original institution. "*The seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God.*" That there is no such declaration in the New Testament respecting the first day is conceded, (p. 105.) "That we have a precept or a passage saying in so many terms that Christ or the apostles made the change in question, is not pretended." But it is added, "no more have we a passage saying, in so many terms, that men are moral agents, or that they have equal rights," &c. The fallacy of this reasoning must be perfectly obvious to every one who considers the difference between *moral principles* and *positive institutions*. Moral duties are legitimately inferable from moral principles. Positive institutions are not. They originate in the will of the Law-giver for reasons which may or may not be revealed to us. Nor can they be known, as many moral duties may be, without definite specification. How can it be known that it is the will of our Father in heaven that the day should be changed, if, as is conceded, neither Jesus Christ or his apostles, "in so many terms," "made the

change?" If they did not do this, on what foundation does the faith and practice of our first day sabbath brethren stand? Certainly in that wisdom of men which is foolishness with God. We will hope that this remarkable concession, together with that of the fact that the first day of the week "was never called sabbath till centuries afterward," will, by divine favor, be the means of bringing some to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.

(Page 104.) our author remarks, "there are three forms of argument, either of which is conclusive of the fact of the change, and of a divine warrant for it."

1. "If we find an express precept declaring the change made or authorised, we have the law."

2. "If we find an express precept affirming the *right* to change the day, we have 'the law.'" "If, then, we find actual traces of such a change in the conduct of those who had this right, we have 'the testimony,' and in the two united we have the evidence again of 'law and testimony' both."

3. "If we can find no express precept of either kind, yet if we can trace the fact of the actual change, through witness after witness, from the present time up to the primitive Christians and the apostles themselves, we have then the evidence of the testimony," &c.

As "that which is wanting cannot be numbered," the first "is not pretended." This however is the evidence the case requires. "Dismissing (it is remarked,) the first and third forms of the appeal, then, we rest the argument on thesecond."

2. "If we find an express precept affirming the *right* to change the day, we have the law." The law *for what*? Is the affirmation of a *right* to do a thing identical with actually doing it? Is the simple declaration of Jesus Christ that he "is Lord of the sabbath day," any more proof that he *changed* the day than that he *abrogated* it? Is it proof of either? Jesus Christ did not say that he was Lord of the sabbath *to change* it. What he *did*, as Lord of the sabbath, we must learn from other passages. John v. 8, Jer. xvii. 21, teaches us that he allowed a violation of the old law. Col. ii. 16, 17, teaches that it was "a shadow" to pass away, not to give place to another shadow, but to the glorious substance, which is himself.

"If, then, we find actual traces of such a change in the conduct of those who had this right, we have the testimony;" &c. True. Where then is the testimony in the New Testament that Jesus Christ or the apostles changed the day? Where is the record that they considered the first day of the week the

sabbath day? Has the writer adduced a single testimony from the only source of authority to prove this? NOT ONE. He has given us the testimony of Eusebius, but not that of Jesus Christ or of his apostles. He admits that the first day of the week "was never called sabbath until centuries afterward." There are no "actual traces of such a change in the conduct" of the apostles in the record of their acts. On the contrary we find two of them traveling on the first day of the week a distance about ten times greater than it was lawful to do on the sabbath-day. Luke xxiv. 13. Nor is there any evidence that when they commenced their journey, they considered it a work of necessity or mercy, although, through the favor of their risen Savior, it unexpectedly proved a most merciful journey to them.

It is affirmed (p. 107,) that "Christ's example as Lord of the sabbath is proof that it was no part of his design to abolish the sabbath," &c. "Before his death and resurrection—he carefully observed the seventh day as the sabbath." "As his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath-day, and stood up for to read." This argument proves too much. It proves equally that it was "no part of his design to abolish the" ceremonial law; for before his death and resurrection he carefully observed that, and told those whom he had healed to go and offer according to the law of Moses. Luke v. 14. That it was his design to abolish this law, "nailing it to his cross," will not be disputed.

But we have seen, in the case of the healed man, that Jesus Christ did not strictly observe the sabbatical law. This was something more than "a hint" of abrogation. Something more also may be found in Col. ii. 16, 17.

It is asked (p. 109,) "If abrogation were his design, could he fail to meet it (i.e. the charge of breaking the sabbath) by saying so. Was he wont to cover up his designs and dodge questions thus?" If there is any force in these questions our author's own theory is equally exposed to it. If a change of the day were his design could he fail to meet the charge by saying so? "Was he wont to cover up his designs and dodge questions thus?" But the truth is that there is no propriety in these questions. It was perfectly proper for our Lord to meet the charge, as he did, by claiming to be "Lord of the sabbath-day." Br. P. (p. 128,) admits the scriptural fact that it was the appointed office of the apostles "more specifically to prescribe the order, institutions, discipline and worship of (the) church." What they did in respect to the sabbath day we find in the direction to the church at Colosse. Chap. ii.

It is remarked (p. 113,) "if it (the sabbath) were not to be abrogated, but perpetuated, then the thing to be done was to separate it from its perversions," &c. It might have been added, if the day was to be changed, the thing to be done was to change it. But I ask, if forbidding a man to carry a burden on the sabbath-day was a *perversion* of the sabbatical law? See *Jer.* xvii. 21. Surely God's own command is not to be denounced as a "*perversion*" of his law! Our Savior's command to the healed man to do that which the law plainly and positively prohibited was a singular way of separating the law from its perversions! Be this as it may, what has a separation from the perversions to do with the point at issue, viz. a change of the day?

It is affirmed (p. 115,) that "the work which the Savior did for the sabbath was precisely that which he did for the marriage institution." What did he for that institution? He quoted the original law of its institution, *Mark* x. 6, 8,—positively forbade the violation of it, ver. 9, and charged upon the violators the guilt of adultery. When and where did he do these things for the sabbath-day? I ask not when did he, like many of his modern disciples, *expatiate* on the importance of keeping the sabbath-day; I ask when did he utter a *single word* for this purpose? He faithfully charged dying men with their sins, specifying their transgressions, but he never charged them with sabbath-breaking. How different, in this respect, from modern professors! Yet we are required to believe that the sabbath is to "live and go down, like marriage, as a permanent institution, to the end of time!"

It is added, "It was a work, too, which he never did for circumcision or for any other institution or ordinance, purely Jewish, and not designed to continue under the gospel dispensation." The scriptural fact is just the reverse of this. See *Mat.* viii. 4. Our Savior commanded the observance of an "ordinance purely Jewish, and not designed to continue under the gospel dispensation," yet he never commanded the observance of the sabbath-day. *Acts* xxi. 21, 24, favors some continuance of *circumcision*, but there is no mention of sabbath-day.

On page 116, we are gravely informed that if Jesus Christ did not authorize a change of the sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, "the reason was," "I have yet many things to say unto you but you cannot bear them now; howbeit, when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you unto all truth." A most profound discovery indeed! A very

convenient way, truly, of accounting for not finding the scriptural evidence a theory demands! Is it not *possible*, my dear brother, after all, that the *scriptural* reason may be the *true one*? Is it not possible that Jesus Christ did not change the day, because he came not to change shadow for *shadow*, but shadow for *substance*? See *Col.* ii. 16, 17.

"Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." The question then is, *when* and *where* did the Spirit of truth reveal to them the change of the sabbath day? If our brother will refer us to such revelation, far be it from us to question its authority. Has he adduced it? *He has not*. Where then is the evidence that this was one of the things which they could not then bear, but which the Spirit was afterward to reveal to them? If the Holy Spirit had guided them into what br. P. believes to be the truth on this subject, would they not *once* at least have done what he is constantly doing, i. e., have denominated the first day of the week the sabbath-day? He himself declares that it "was never called sabbath until centuries afterward." (p. 155.) By this concession, he has shut himself up to the faith that the change was not made by Jesus or his disciples. That the positive institution of the first day of the week, as the sabbath-day, could be established without *once* so denominating it, must exceed even the logical acumen of our author to prove. What "the Spirit of truth" taught them on the subject we have seen in *Rom.* xiv. 5, 6, *Col.* ii. 16, 17. The reader is requested to consider the fact that this latter passage is *the only passage in the inspired writings of the apostles in which there is express mention of the sabbath with any explanation of the subject in reference to the duty of christians concerning it*. This fact is itself sufficient to show how perfectly futile are all attempts to establish "the perpetuity" of a sabbath-day on apostolic authority. The accordance of our author's teaching with that of the apostles is precisely that of "*perpetuity*," with "*a shadow*" which passeth away!

(P. 118,) it is remarked, "Previous to his death, as we have seen, Christ was in the regular and habitual observance of the seventh as sabbath-day. Afterwards, when, by his death and resurrection, the old dispensation was fully at an end and the new one fully introduced, we never find him in the synagogue or meeting with his disciples for religious purposes on that day. But he did meet with them for such purposes on the first day of the week." Now as "the order and worship of the church" was "a matter to be *especially* attended to by" the apostles,

(p. 116.) the above reasoning proves more *against* a change of the day than *in favor* of it; for, we have the fact of the apostles going into the synagogues *on the seventh-day*, after the new dispensation was fully introduced, for the very same purpose which Jesus Christ went there *before* that period. Acts, xiii. 42, xviii. 4. The plain truth is, that Jesus Christ and his apostles went into the synagogues to preach the gospel and not to establish any sabbath-day. See Acts xvii. 2, 3: Luke iv. 15, 22.

The meeting of Jesus with his disciples, and the subsequent meeting of believers, for the observance of christian ordinances, on the first day of the week, Acts xx. 7, are examples which it is our duty and high privilege to imitate, but no proof that it is the sabbath-day. For the purpose of stated social and public worship, it was necessary that some day should be appointed. As it is "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead," that believers are begotten "unto a lively hope" of their incorruptible inheritance, how proper it is, that, *on the day on which that glorious fact occurred*, they should assemble to unite their high praises to the Rock of their salvation! Br. P. after taxing his logical powers in the manner he has, in the examination of the inferences of his opponents, is the last man to infer from the simple fact of the disciples meeting *on the evening* of the first day of the week for divine worship, that it was therefore the sabbath-day of the fourth commandment.

In chapter 12, the fact of the apostles being authorised by their divine master to organize and regulate the christian churches, is stated and proved. To which is subjoined the words (p. 131.) "Here we have *the law*." The law for what? The law *constituting the apostles rulers in the churches*. Is that "the law" *changing the sabbath-day*? What proof is this of the matter at issue? Yet our author, as if he had produced the law changing the day, proceeds immediately to remark, "The question now is, what is 'the TESTIMONY'?" We will however be satisfied if he will give us the *TESTIMONY of inspiration*. "The testimony (it is remarked,) is of course of two kinds—that of the scripture record, and that of authentic ecclesiastical history." As of the first kind none is to be found, reference "of course" must be had to the latter, although (p. 16,) he allows that *all* he knows (i. e. I suppose, of any authority,) is "from the bible." We have no objection to hear, *as a matter of history*, of the corruptions from "the simplicity which is in Christ," but receiving THE BIBLE as the ONLY rule of faith and practice, in the determination of the question at

issue, we, "of course," shall allow the testimony of uninspired ecclesiastical history no place. "As to me," said Martin Luther, "I do not cease my cry of 'The Gospel! The Gospel!—Christ! Christ!' and my enemies are as ready with their answer—'Custom! Custom! Ordinances! Ordinances!—Fathers! Fathers!' 'That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men but in the power of God,' says St. Paul; and by this thunder-clap from heaven he overturns and disperses, as the wind scatters the dust, all the foolish thoughts of men."

Tell me not of the perfection of the first age of the church. What meaneth this scripture? "Ye observe days and months, and times and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain," Gal. iv. 10, 11.

What then does our brother give us from the only source of authority to prove the change of the day?

(P. 131.) "The apostles and early disciples were in the habit of meeting together *at stated times*, for *public religious worship*." But cannot this be done without a sabbath-day? Did not those christians who esteemed "*every day alike*" thus meet? Do not such now meet thus? Has not Br. P. himself met with his brethren on the first Monday in the month, for years? Is this any proof that the day was the sabbath-day? Has he not met "*at stated times*" *every week* on some other besides the first day of the week? The fact then that "meetings were held regularly every first day of the week" is no proof of the change of the sabbath-day.

It is said that the first day of the week is "the Lord's day." Is this proof that it is the sabbath of the fourth commandment excepting the change of the day? Has any inspired writer informed us that this was the reason of its being so denominated? There is no conclusive evidence that the day John called "the Lord's day" was the first day of the week, although we suppose so; not, however, because it is *the sabbath-day*, but because it was the day our blessed Redeemer rose from the dead. It would have been a palpable and gross inconsistency for the Apostles to have required the heaven-born heirs of the NEW COVENANT to keep sabbath-day, after assuring them by the Holy Spirit that sabbath-days were "A SHADOW" of Christ their spiritual REST, into which, by faith, they had entered! Blessed be the God of our salvation, our sabbath is not *weekly*, but as constant and perpetual as the exercise of our holy faith and love!

P. 155. It is said that the first day, or christian sabbath, was not referred to at all," Col. ii. 16, 17. True, and for a

very adequate reason, *there was no such sabbath*. If there had been, *how could the apostle, consistently with the truth of the gospel, avoid a reference to it, to make it an exception?* The proof given by the writer that the christian sabbath was not referred to at all is worthy of special attention. It is the fact, that the first day of the week was *never called sabbath until centuries afterwards!*" But why is not this fact equal proof that such a christian sabbath-day did not exist? If it did exist, although it was not so denominated, why might not the apostle refer to it although it was not so denominated? Our author's own reasoning leads to the truth that the first day of the week became the sabbath-day, *not by apostolic testimony*, but by human tradition some "centuries afterwards."

Yet, with a peculiar assurance, we are informed that "The change is just what we should expect in the event of their being any; it is just what the circumstances of the case demands." (p. 163.) Indeed! a *positive institution* is to be established, but we are not to expect a single declaration that it is so! Jesus Christ, or his apostles, changed the sabbath-day from the *seventh to the first* day of the week, but it is presumptuous to expect to find one text in the New Testament informing us that they did so! We are not to expect that the first day of the week should by them be once named the sabbath-day, nor indeed by anybody else until some "centuries afterwards!" nor are we to expect a single exhortation from Jesus Christ or any apostle to keep holy the sabbath-day thus established! What then are we to expect? Why we are to expect two or three things, *all of which might have existed without any sabbath day at all!*

Of Rom. xiv. 5, it is asked, "What proof is there that the 'day' spoken of was a sabbath of any kind? The term 'sabbath' does not occur at all in the text or context." In this case, it appears that *the actual mention of the term 'sabbath'* is of some importance to the argument. We ask then our brother to apply his own reasoning to his own supposed evidences of the change of the sabbath day. Of the meetings of Jesus Christ with his disciples on the evening of the first day of the week, and of the stated meetings of christians afterwards on the same day, he should ask himself, "What proof is there that the 'day' spoken of was a sabbath of any kind? The term 'sabbath' does not occur at all in the text or context." From Rom. ii. 17, it appears that there were believing Jews in the church at Rome, many of whom were "zealous of the law (Acts xxi. 20,) which included the *seventh day sabbath*." The force

of the passage, however, as a proof against the supposed change of the sabbath day, does not depend upon our demonstrating what particular day is alluded to, for be it what it may, on the supposition of the first day of the week being a sabbath-day, as was the seventh under the law, the apostle could not have allowed any christians to consider "*every day alike*," without trifling with the commandment of the Lord.

Could Moses, consistently with the fourth commandment, allow the Israelite to esteem "*every day alike*?" Will our brother allow it? So far from it, he requires that we "keep the first day of the week as sabbath *with all the sacredness of original obligation*, or go back to the seventh and keep that." (p. 97.) How conclusive is the apostolic teaching in the passage before us, against such a shadowy theory.

(P. 142.) Several passages are referred to in which the term "the first day of the week" occurs. Respecting these passages it is remarked, that in the original the word sabbaton, ("sabbath" or "sabbaths") is found. Br. P. does not indeed adduce these as examples of the first day of the week being called the sabbath-day, which would be to contradict his own assertion that it "never was called sabbath until centuries afterwards;" but he ought to have stated the fact that as there is no Greek word for week excepting sabbaton, (sabbath) it is in these passages used to express "the first day of the week, and not that the first day of the week is the sabbath-day." The English reader may perceive this by referring to *Matt. xxviii. 1*, which is one of the passages quoted. It would be nonsense to read, "In the end of the sabbath as it began to dawn toward" the sabbath, instead of "toward the first day of the week."

Having thus examined the testimony "of the scripture record" offered by Br. P., without finding any divine authority for either the *universality*, or *perpetuity*, or *change* of the sabbath day, we may consider that our work is accomplished. I am willing however to perform a brief work of supererogation, and examine the testimony from "ecclesiastical history."

This, we are informed, (p. 159,) "states, indeed, in terms, that the sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week by authority of Christ himself," &c. *Athanasius* (A. D. 326,) says, "The Lord himself hath changed the day of the sabbath to Lord's day." Happily, he does not add, as in some other cases, "he that doth not so believe shall be damned everlastingly." On what principle are we to receive the testimony of one uninspired man, that the Lord himself changed the sabbath day, rather than the testimony of another, that the

Lord himself changed the bishop of the single church of Rome into a bishop of all the churches on earth and made him his only vicar!

(P. 161.) a quotation from Eusebius is given on the subject of the transfer of the sabbath, and a bold assertion of our author, that "This establishes the fact that the transfer of the sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week was made by Christ himself." What shall we have next? Here the declaration of an *uninspired and fallible* man, who lived about three hundred years after Jesus Christ and his apostles, is admitted as establishing a supposed fact which contradicts the *inspired testimony of the apostle*, Col. ii. 16, 17. Will br. P. be consistent, and allow that *whatever* else the bishop of Cesarea has written as the doctrine of Christ, is consequently established as such? Was it not possible for Eusebius to make an erroneous inference from what our Lord said on the subject of the sabbath? What *certain* source of knowledge respecting what the Son of God did three hundred years before, did he possess, besides the same New Testament that we have? Br. P. may as well assert the infallibility of Eusebius, as to assert what he has, for on no other principle can the assertion be sustained.

Let us, for our edification, hear the good bishop a little farther. "All things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the sabbath" (seventh day) "these we have transferred to the Lord's day, as more appropriately belonging to it," &c. What was the Israelite's "duty to do on the sabbath?" "And on the sabbath-day two lambs of the first year without spot, and two tenth-deals of flour for a meat-offering, mingled with oil, and the drink-offering thereof. This is the burnt-offering of every sabbath, besides the continual burnt-offering, and his drink-offering," Numb. xxviii. 9, 10. Did the bishop of Cesarea transfer these offerings to the Lord's day "as more appropriately belonging to it?" It may be said that Eusebius refers to christian ordinances. But what had the Jewish sabbath to do with these? Surely if the bishop and his contemporaries "transferred to the Lord's day" "all things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the (Jewish) sabbath," they might well confess, "we have done those things which we ought not to have done, and have left undone those which we ought to have done."

Other quotations are given, proving that the first day of the week was called the Lord's-day. This however is no proof that it was the sabbath of the fourth commandment, the day only changed.

Numb xvi, 46 Money + XXI 150 Gent
page 6

page 8 Jan 9. 6th Nickson

1 Exo xxi, 30 of Money for ransom
Exo xx, 12 Ransom

16 Attonement money -
to make attonement for yours
Job x + iii, 24 Ransom for
Attonement -

Mat x, 24 Son of man
gave his life a ransom
for many -

John x, 15 I lay down
my life for the sheep.

Jer xvi, 11 For the life of
the flesh
in the blood I have given
to make an attonement for the

1 pet. i, 18-19 Not redeemed
with silver & gold
but with the precious blood
of Christ Redeem is brought
Rom xiv, 4 Money

1 Cor. vi, 20 Bought with a price
his x, 20 Christ & God price

1 pet. i, 18-19 Not redeemed
with silver & gold

